

A N
ANSWER
TO THE
Brief History
OF THE
Unitarians,
Called also
SOCINIANS.

Prov. 18. 17. *He that is first in his own
Cause seems just; but his Neighbour
comes, and searches him.*

By William Basset, Rector of
St. Swithin, London.

London, Printed, and Sold by Randal Taylor, near
Stationers-Hall, 1693.

ANSWER

H H T G T

Brief History

227-1-1

RECEIVED



2014102

Prov. 18. He that is full in his own
 Cause, hath many foes; but he that
 is lowly, and humble, shall have many
 friends.

By Commission of the Government of the State of New York, in and for the County of New York, ss. I, the undersigned, Clerk of the said County, do hereby certify that the within and foregoing is a true and correct copy of the original thereof, as the same appears from the records of the said County.

1944

TO THE
Most Reverend Father in God;

J O H N,

By Divine Providence

Lord Archbishop

O F

Canterbury.

Primate of *England*, and
Metropolitan, and One of
Their Majesties Most Ho-
nourable Privy-Council.

IT is the Design of these Papers to
baffle and expose those Little
Pleas and Objections which the Late
Author of the *Socinian* Letters hath

A 3

ur-

urged against the Divinity of the Son.

My Lord,

This Cause doth merit, as well as the Author want your Grace's Patronage; For which Reason I humbly presume to prefix so Great a Name, not doubting but they will meet with what Favour they may either deserve or want. That that God who has created, would preserve, guide and strengthen you in those Undertakings which so great a Place doth call, and so Pious a Mind more Large and Rich than that Place it self doth dispose you to, for the well-governing the Church, and the Uniting us in the True Faith, and in all the Designs and Interests of Religion, is the earnest Prayer of

Your Grace's

Most Humble Servant,

William Bassett.

TO THE READER.

When I first met with these Socinian Letters, and found that words, and fallacy were their whole composition; I could not but think them so unlike their Patrons, or their Patrons so unlike the Character they affect, which is to be men of Wit and Reason, that I Judged them not Worthy an answer. But since it appears that these, like some other the worst things among us, do not want their admirers, I thought this performance my duty.

In it I have answered not only the first of these letters, but divers parts of the rest, as well as some things in more manly writers, as Eriedinus, Crellius, &c. By calling in the other letters to assist this, and other Socinian authors, to supply the weakness of them all, I put the Objections, in their full strength, to the end their overthrow may be the more conspicuous to the world, and the more sensible to themselves. If they venture
upon

upon argument, and do any thing, that affects the cause, I am ready to support it, But if they only load me with words, and cavils, I must neglect them.

If these labours are succesful in recovering any, whom this Heresy hath infected, and in preserving those, who yet are whole, and hereby in giving any check to the growing errors, and prophaneſs of the age, I shall place the time spent upon this argument among my happy minutes. That it may be productive of such blessed effects, was the hope, and design, and shall be the prayers of

Yours,

W. B.

A N

ANSWER
 To the FIRST of the
Four LETTERS,
INTITLED,
A Brief History.

THESE LETTERS ARE INTITLED, A BRIEF HISTORY; yet instead of *History* you find little, if any, but an *abuse of divers Authors* in the end of the First. *A Title* is foreign from the Letters, as the Letters from the Truth, that is, *neither to the point,*

THAT term [*Unitarian*] is put as a distinction between them and us: take it as it signifies him, who believes *one only God, exclusive of all others;*

and then it makes a distinction without a difference; for we are as intirely in that Faith, as the Socinian can be: but as they make it signify one, who believes the Father only to be God, exclusive of the Son, and the Holy Ghost, I must declare it a term suitable to these Letters, *i. e.* full of Error, and Blasphemy.

That word [Socinian] we leave to the Followers of Socinus, who (their beloved Sandius saith) differed from all the World; which proclaims those under this denomination, Men of Novelty and Error.

The Title Page quotes *Act. 17. 11.* They searched the Scriptures daily, whether these things were so.

Answer. St. Basil saith of Eusebius; *Idem.* I. 1. 5. *Carus sua scriptura scripta, et non scripta. Non sequest, that thou mayst find, not Faith, but Infidelity; not to discover a Truth, but to establish an Error.* This (I fear) we shall find too true of our Socinians; who wrest the Rule of Truth to their own prejudicate Opinions. Sure I am, did men sincerely follow this example, we should find but few of this
 pere

persuasion, since their Heresy is founded not upon Scripture, but upon those false Glosses, and Sophistical Evasions, which make the Scriptures of none effect.

The Preamble to the Letter pretends, that his Friend demands an account of the Socinians. Their Doctrine concerning God (in which only they differ from other Christians) the Remonstrants professedly agreeing with them in other points of Faith, and Doctrine.

Answer, Their Doctrine concerning God is, That the Father only is God; P. 4. But that they differ from other Christians in other points beside this, is notorious to the world.

They own the Arians to be Christians, and Unitarians, because they agree with themselves in this Doctrine; P. 35. But the Arians ascribe to the Son the Creation of the World, while the Socinians deny his Existence before the Incarnation: Therefore either the Arians are no Christians, or the Socinians differ from other Christians in other Doctrines besides this.

But he would prove that in other points the *Sacrinians* agree with other Christians, because in other points they agree with the *Remonstrants*: Which implies,

1. That there is no difference between themselves, and the *Remonstrants*, but this, which is well known to be false, And

2. That themselves, and *Remonstrants* are all the Christians in the World: Because he makes it, that their agreement with these doth prove their agreement with other Christians; but this is false too: Because these *Remonstrants* were condemned by the Synod at Dort about the five Propositions.

You have then a double falshood in the compass of this one Parenthesis; the one in enlarging the number of his Friends; the other in lessening the number of his Errors. The design of which must be to perswade the Reader, That there is but one step between the Orthodox Faith, and this Heresy, to the end he may the more easily decy into it.

Accord

According to this beginning you must expect but little, if any truth, and honesty in this Letter, which we shall now consider.

SECT. II.

He saith, P. 4. That Christ was a Man, the Son, Prophet, Messenger, Minister, Servant, and Creature of God; and himself God, they think is proved by these (as they call them) Arguments.

Answer. I Am glad to find any modesty in a Socinian, for they [call] them Arguments; and they [think] they prove: But with better assurances we declare they are no Arguments; nor do they prove the point in Controversy: For though they prove that Christ is Man, yet they do not prove he is no more than Man, or is not God. This will easily appear from our Examination of his Arguments themselves, which are these,

Argum. 1. P. 3. *If Christ were himself God, there could be no Person greater than him: But himself saith, Joh. 14. 28. my Father is greater than I.*

Ans. I deny the Consequence: Because though the Son is less than the Father in some respects, yet he is equal to the Father in others. None of the former do destroy his Divinity, but the latter do prove it. For,

1. The Son is less than the Father, in regard of his Humane Nature, and Offices: But these (we shall prove) are not inconsistent with his Divinity. And,

2. In regard of his Sonship. For the Father is of himself, but the Son is of the Father. Whence *Episcopus* infers a Subordination of Persons, but yet establishes the Doctrine of a Trinity. So the *Nicene* Fathers taught, That the Son is *God of God*, that is, God of, and from the Father; but yet withall asserted, That he is of the same Substance with the Father; and consequently is God, as the Father is. And indeed this

this Subordination cannot destroy his Divinity, because it doth not destroy his Nature: For the Inequality arises not from the Essence, but from the order, and manner of subsistence. But,

3. In other respects the Son is equal to the Father; this the Apostle asserts, *Phil. 2. 6. Who being in the form of God, thought it not Robbery to be equal with God, viz. the Father.* Now if he thought it no robbery, it could be no robbery; and if no robbery, he must be equal; and if equal, he must be God by Nature, as the Father is.

This leads to the true sense of those words [*Being in the Form of God*] for though *μορφή*, or it self strictly signifies not Substance, so much as Accidents; not so much the Nature, as the Appearance of things; whence *Erasmus*, and the *Socinians*, would have these words to signify, not that he is God, but that he was like to God. yet however the Apostle must here intend it Substantially: that is, his being in the *Form of God*, must signify that he is God; as his being in the *Form of a*

Servant, signifies, that he was a *Servant*. And the Reason is, because his equality with God is here inferred from his being in the *Form of God*; but there cannot be an equality between a thing, and the mere likeness of it; between a real Nature, and a bare similitude. Whence *Erasmus* understood the force of the Word, but not the reach of the Apostle's Argument.

Though *Erasmus* doth not deny the Divinity of the Son, yet because he thinks this Text doth not respect his Nature; I shall therefore oppose to his sence the judgment of the Ancients; as *Arnob.* & *Serap. conflic.* l. 2. *Novat. de Trin. c.* 17. *Hilar. Pict. Epist. de Trin.* l. 8. & 10. *Greg. Nyss. tom.* 2. *cont. Eunom.* Ora. 7. &c. Which judgment of theirs I shall confirm by these Arguments; *viz.*

1. By the matter of the Apostle's Argument, he was in the *Form of God*, and in the *Form of a Servant*. If this Text speaks him not God, but like to God; it must also speak him not a Servant, but like to a Servant. But that he was

a Servant he saith himself, *Mat. 20. 28.*
I came to minister; and therefore he
 must be God; because the same Phrase,
 and Sense applyed to each Nature, must
 import the reality of the one, as well as
 of the other.

2. The order of the parts speaks our
 sense: For *being in the form of God*, i. e.
 While he was in the form of God, he
 took upon him the form of a Servant;
 therefore that form was before this. But
 there was no such difference in the parts
 of his Life, or Condition upon Earth,
 that one should merit to be called the
form of God, the other the *form of a*
Servant: Therefore his being in the
 form of God must be antecedent to his
 humane Life.

3. This was his choice, and voluntar-
 ry Act, for he took upon him the form of a
 Servant: But he had no liberty of choice
 in this world; because his condition
 here was determined and foretold;
 whence himself saith, *Luke 24. 44.* *That*
all things must be fulfilled, which were writ-
ten in the Law of Moses, and in the Pro-
phets, and in the Psalms, concerning me;
 there-

therefore this choice was before this life; and consequently must be the Act of the Divine, not of the Humane Nature. So evidently doth this Text respect the Nature of Christ; and therefore declare him to be equal to God the Father, as being God by Nature, as the Father is.

This Equality our Saviour himself doth prove, *Job. 5. 17. My Father works hitherto, and I work*: whence the Jews concluded *v. 18. that he made himself equal to God*: Upon which he doth not explain himself, as if they mis-understood him; which he did in the case of *eating his flesh, and drinking his blood*: But *v. 19. he proves this equality, what things soever the Father doth, these [namely] the very same, the Son doth likewise*. Whence he must be equal to the Father in Operation, and consequently in Power. So *Ambrose de fid. l. 1. c. 13. and Greg. Naz. Orat. 36.* Hence he requires *v. 23. That all men should honour the Son, even as they honour the Father*; which imports an equality of Honour flowing from an equality of Operation;

Operation; for the reason of the duty instructs us in the nature of the duty itself. This Honour is owing from their works, but they both do the same works, therefore they must both have the same Honour.

Hence Joh. 10. 30, *I, and my Father are one*; that is, not in concord only, as the Socinian pretends, but in power: Because the context speaks not of Wills and Affections, but of *keeping his sheep*: none shall pluck them out of my hands; because none is able to pluck them out of my Father's hands; for which he gives this reason, *I, and my Father are one*; which must be one in power. And if they be one in power, they must be one in Nature; unless you make an Almighty Creature, which is not only an absolute contradiction, but also confounds the essential properties of God, and the Creature; which is a much viler Absurdity, than they can with any shadows of Reason pretend against our Doctrine. That gloss then of *Athanasius* *cont. Ari. Orat. 4.* must be admitted, viz. This

This shows the sameness of the
 God-head, and the Unity of Power.
 For indeed the ascribing to the Son the
 same Infinite Perfections, and the same
 Honour, but not the same Nature with
 the Father, as the *Socinian* doth, pro-
 claims not only the perverseness of the
 Disputant, but the Idolatry of the Pro-
 fessors too.

In that case of his being the *Messias*, he
 sends Men to his works, whose Nature,
 and agreeableness to ancient Prophecies,
 do sufficiently declare the point. So
 here he first asserts his equality with the
 Father, then improves it to an Unity in
 Power, and Honour, and then leaves
 men to conclude from thence an Unity
 of Nature. This is the most rational
 way of teaching; for positive affirma-
 tions tell us things are so; but Natural,
 and necessary consequences, such as
 these are, prove they must be so. There-
 fore though the Father is greater, than
 the Son, as the Father is of himself, and
 is God only, while the Son is of the
 Father, and is both God and Man, yet
 the

the Son is equal to, nay, *One* with the Father in Operation; and if in Operation, then in Power; and if in Power, then in Nature: and therefore must be God.

He proceeds p. 5. to manage this Argument from Job. 20. 17. *I ascend to my God, and your God*: whence he fancies, the Son is not God, because another is his God.

Ans. As Christ is Man, and we his Brethren, so our God is his God: This proves that he is Man, but cannot prove, he is not himself God, which is the design of this Letter. Nay, as the Son is God of God, i. e. God the Son of, and from God the Father, so the Father may be his God, as well as his Father: without weakning the Doctrine of his Divinity. So far is this Text from concluding his Point, that it makes nothing against us.

He adds, Job. 32. 49. *The Father, which sent me, he gave me a Commandment*. The Argument is, the Son is not God, because the Father commands, and sends him. *To* *Ans.* This hath been answered already.

dy, For in what respects the Father is greater than the Son, in the same respects the Father may command, and send the Son: But as the Father's being greater than the Son, doth not destroy the Divinity of the Son, because (as before) it doth not destroy his Nature; so neither can his commanding and sending him, because this Power flows as a right, or consequence from his Superiority, And if the Father's Superiority it self cannot destroy the Son's Divinity; that Power, which is implied, or wrapt up in the very Nature of that Superiority, can never do it.

h. ang. 2. P. 3. 6. If Christ were God, he would not be the Creature of God. But that he is the Creature of God, he would

fail to prove from two Scriptures; the former is *Heb. 3. 1, 2. The High Priest of our Profession Jesus Christ, who was faithful to him, that appointed him.* In the Greek, and in the Margin it is, *faithful to him that made him.*

Ang. 2. P. 3. 6. The meaning is, that appointed, or made him High Priest, respects not his Being, but the Designation of him

him

him to that Office. In this sense we use the Phrase of making a Bishop. Yet this (it seems) is a Socinian Creation.

His other Text is, Colos. 1. 15. which calls him the First-born of every Creature, whence he would have him to be but a Creature.

Ans. He is the First-born of every Creature not in kind as one of them, but in regard of an Existence prior to them. Whence v. 17. He was before all things. To this agrees that of St. John Ch. 1. 1. In the beginning was the Word, &c. when all things first began, then this Word, this first-born I was I or did exist. And both this Apostle and the Evangelist with one consent declare him not a Creature himself, but the Maker of all Creatures, for Colos. 1. 16. By him were all things created. And John 1. 3. By him were all things made. This drives the Socinian to three most palpable falsehoods, viz.

1. These words I by him were all things created, Colos. 1. 16. I interpret (say they) not of Christ, but of God, Lev. 2. P. 131.

Ans.

Anſw. They grant us, P. 130. that
 V. 15. which runs thus; the Image of
 the Invisible God, and the First-born of ev-
 ery Creature, is spoke of Christ: And
 consequently, V. 16. must be spoke of
 him too, because that word [him]
 by him were all things created, cannot
 possibly have any other Antecedent, than
 the Image of the Invisible God, and the First-
 born of every Creature: whence immedi-
 ately follows this, 16 P. For by him, 1. e.
 by this First-born were all things created.

They would have indeed the [Invi-
 sible God] to be the Antecedent, that
 by him, viz. the Father, were all things
 created. But Sense, Coherence, Gram-
 matical Construction, and other paral-
 lel Texts, can never allow this. Because
 the Subject of that 15th. Verse, is
 Christ; who is called the Image, and
 the First-born; but those words [the
 Invisible God] are but an adjunct, de-
 signed only to show us whose Image he
 is: But now the Relative must respect
 the Subject, not that, which is but a de-
 pendent upon it.

These words [the first-born of
 every

every creature] do follow those words
 [the invisible God] for the Text runs
 thus; *The Image of the invisible God, the
 first-born of every creature.* Therefore to
 these, *the first-born* the Relative
 [him] must immediately refer; that
 by him, *viz. Christ*, who is this Image,
 this first-born, were all things created.

Sometimes indeed a Relative may re-
 fer to not the next, but a remoter An-
 tecedent. But this is only in two cases.
 As either for the sake of sense, or for
 the avoiding that interpretation, which
 may contradict some other text; but
 neither of these can be pretended in the
 case before us. For the sense is as com-
 plete, and natural, as well as the con-
 struction more easy, if the Relative re-
 fer to the *first-born*, as if it refer to the
invisible God; and the referring it to this
 first-born, doth not contradict any text;
 but concurs with all them, that ascribe
 creation to the Son. Therefore the So-
 cinian can have no other reason for his
 construction, but only the support of
 an Heresy.

2. They say, That all things were
 made not [by] but [for] him.

To Answer, This is totally overthrown by
 St. John ch. 1. 9. By him were all things

made; and without him was not any thing made, that was made. Where observe that the Evangelist doth industriously secure the title of Creator to the Son.

1. By an Universal Affirmative, which includes all things made, in the number of his Creatures, for by him were all things made. And,

2. By an Universal Negative, which denies there ever was any creature, which was not created by him; for without him was not any thing made, that was made.

No Text saith so much in reference to the Father; therefore they may at least as fairly deny the Father to be Creator, as the Son; and doubtless the design of the Holy Writer is to obviate and expose all Cavils against this Doctrine.

3. They fly to a Metaphorical Creation, that he did not make, but renewed all things after they were made.

Ans. This is impossible: for Colos. 1. 16. By him were all things created, that are in Heaven, — whether they be Thrones, or Dominions, or Principalities, or Powers. — By which the Socinian, Let. 4. P. 133. understands Angelick Orders; but the Holy Angels were not renewed, for they kept their Stations, and therefore did

did not want it. And the fallen Angels were denied it.

The same Letter P. 132. saith, That all things were *modelled*, not *created* by him; and P. 133. explains it thus, Christ is said to *modell* and *order* all things upon earth, because of the great change he introduced. For which sence he quotes *Camero*, *Piscator*, *Diodate*, *Dallee*, *Vorstius*, *Davenant*, and *Grosius*.

Answ. I can find nothing in *Camero*, *Dallee*, and *Vorstius*, upon this Text: Had they spoke to his purpose, I doubt not but he would have given us particular References.

Piscator saith, all things were *per eum condita*, made, or created by him; as the word usually signifies. But for Argument sake, suppose it may in a remoter, and looser sence signifie also to *modell* and *order*: Yet let the *Socinian* tell me, what reason he hath to tye *Piscator*'s sence to these, exclusive of that: Since that is the common import of the Word, and is agreeable to the mind of this Author, who, upon all occasions, asserts the Divinity of the Son, and ascribes to him the creation of the world. For upon these words *John* 1. 3. *By him were all things made*; *Piscator* saith, the

Evangelist doth here assert the Deity of the Son from the effects, or things, that he hath done, *videlicet ex omnium rerum conditarum creatione*, from his creating all things made: where himself applies this word [*condita*] to the creation of the World by the Son. Therefore the Socinian is false, and unjust in pretending that this Author understands it not of creation, but of modeling, and ordering things.

Diedas is so far from the Socinian sence, that upon these words he asserts the Eternal Generation of the Son, and speaks him with the Father an equal, and co-operating cause of all things.

Daumenius upon this Text thus, *Christus non est creatura, sed creator omnium prior, quia per ipsum condita sunt*. Christ is no creature, but is before all creatures, because they were all made by him. Where this Author by this word [*condita*] must necessarily mean a creation, properly, because he gives this as a reason, why Christ is no creature, but is before all creatures, *nam, because he made them*. But he cannot possibly understand by it to [*model*] or [*order*] because he might model or order, and yet not be a creature, and after those

those creatures too. Therefore the *Socinian* doth here pervert the sense of this Author, and also totally ruines that Argument, by which he proves that sense: Which is a crime so false and malicious, that it can admit no Palliation.

As for *Grotius*, he shows indeed, that the word here rendred to create, doth not always signifie properly to create, but is sometimes applyed to the new creature. We grant it: But by the leave of so great a man, and of this little *Socinian* too; this doth not prove it doth not signifie properly to create, in this text. That it is taken improperly in some places is no Argument that it ought to be improperly in this. Though I shall prove in it's place that *Grotius* was neither *Arian* nor *Socinian*; yet I must say, that he hath not in all places done that justice to this Cause, which he might and ought to have done it.

It is worth our while to observe, that to prove that Christ is a creature, these men will have *creare* (which signifies to create, in as large, and loose a sense, as the English word [make] doth, as to make the World, to make a Verse, &c.) to signifie properly to

create in *Heb. 3. 2.* contrary (as we have shown) to the evident sense, and design of that place: But to prove he did not make the World, they will have *κρίω*, in *Colos. 1. 16.* to signifie not to create, but to model and order: Though it doth most properly signify to create, and *V. 17.* by ascribing to him an Existence prior to all things, ought to lead and determine us to this sense.

This is plain shuffling: And indeed where men will take words of a various signification in such a sense as is agreeable to their own Hypothesis, but not to the scope, and design of the place, that uses 'em, they may perplex any truth, and colour over the foulest Heresy in the World; and in fine, turn the whole Scriptures into contradictions, and nonsense.

That Christ was no creature, I shall further prove against this Letter, and the *Arian* both, by these two steps;

1. That he was before all creatures, and
2. That he was from eternity.

1. He asserts his own Existence before the world: for *John 17. 5.* He had Glory with the Father before the world; and therefore

fore he must exist before it : for *non
entis nulla sunt predicata.*

They say indeed, this Glory was in decree only, as the Lamb was slain from the foundation of the world in decree only : But these are not parallel cases ; for then that Lamb could be slain no otherwise. But the Scriptures do abundantly declare that Christ did actually exist before the world ; and therefore might be actually glorified before it. Necessity requires that interpretation as to the Lamb ; but there is no such necessity in this case ; and therefore no such interpretation is to be admitted : for we must never leave the common, proper, and literal sense of a Scripture ; unless it be for the sake of a concurrence with, or non-contradiction of some other Scripture, which is not in this case ; because no Scripture saith, he did not exist before the world.

This is a fallacy *2 bene conjunctis ad male divisa* : when Men put such odd constructions upon a Text taken by it self, which it abhors, when taken together with others. For, in this case, was there no Text but this, which ascribes to him a Being before the World, their

gloss might [perhaps] seem to have a little colour of probability in it; and that is the most it could then pretend to: But take this Scripture together with those, that declare he did exist, when all things began, *Joh. 1. 1.* That he was before all things, *Coloss. 1. 17.* That he made and created all things *Joh. 1. 3. Col. 1. 16.* The case is so plain from the light, which one text gives to another, that a Man would think that none, but the wilfully blind, could mistake it.

If in this manner we follow this, or some other point in controversy between the *Socinian* and our selves from one text to another, till we have laid all those together, which speak to the same point; one would think that either the Scripture is so worded, that it is extremely apt to lead all plain honest minds into error: or else that the *Socinian* sense is but mere shuffles, and evasions of the truth. One of these must be: Judge, & choose, but consider it is on the part of God, and *Socinus*, who stand here opposed each to other.

Upon this Scripture *Irenaeus* in the next age after the Apostles *4. c. 28.* Thus, *qui omnia ex deo glorificat Verbum Patris / qui ex gloria Patris est: Before*

fore every Creature the Word, i. e. the Son, did glorifie his Father, and was glorified by him. By which this Father doth speak,

1. His Existence before all Creatures: For every thing did glorifie it's maker so soon as it did exist; but the Son did glorifie his Father before all Creatures, and consequently did exist before them. And,

2. His Divinity. For had *Irenaeus* numbred the Son with the Creatures, as the first of them in the *Arian* sence; or as the last of them in the *Socinian*; he must have worded it with some respect to them, as thus, before all [other] Creatures: or the *first of all Creatures*; the Son did glorifie, &c. but this form distinguishes him from all Creatures, not as one of them, but as being already distinct from, as well as before them all.

The Son then was before the World, i. e. before the Creation, and consequently before all creatures, which was the thing to be proved; whence it follows, that there is no necessity of taking those Texts, which ascribe Creation to him, in an improper sence; and if no necessity, they must be taken in a proper one;

because all Scriptures must be taken properly; unless that sense doth contradict some other Scripture; which is not in the case before us, because no Text saith the Son did not, or that the Father only did create the World.

2. Since the Son was before the world, he must be from Eternity; because the Scriptures no where suggest a creation between Eternity and Time: But on the contrary, *Moses* declares that the creation of the World was *the beginning*, viz. of the creature, and consequently there could be no creature before it. Whence in the Scripture-Phrase to be in the beginning, that is, before the world; and to be from Eternity, are the same thing. For wisdom doth thus express her Eternal Existence, *Prov. 8. 22, 23. He possessed me in the beginning of his ways, before his works of old. I was set up from everlasting, from the beginning, or ever the earth was: and v. 24, 25. when there were no depths, I was brought forth; when there were no Fountains abounding with water: before the mountains were settled, before the Hills was I brought forth. Thus to be in the beginning, and to be before the world, are Phrases,*
which

which the Spirit uses to express the Eternal existence of wisdom: but the Son was in the beginning, *Joh. 1. 1.* he was before all things, *Colos. 1. 17.* and before the world, *Joh. 17. 5.* therefore the same Phrases must as well express the Eternal existence of the Son too.

If the Son then was any where called a creature, it must be restrained to his man-hood, as his descent from *Abraham* is, *Rom. 9. 5.* it was *κατὰ σάρκα* as to the flesh: which restriction must imply that there is something excepted, as to which he is no creature; and as to which he did not descend from *Abraham*; which can be no other than the Divine Nature: whence the next words say, he is over all God blessed for ever. *Irenaeus l. 3 c. 18.* reads it thus, *Ex quibus Christus secundum carnem, qui est Deus super omnes benedictus in saecula.* Of whom Christ was according to the Flesh, who is God over all blessed for ever: and *Tert. adv. Prax. c. 13.* thus, -- who is *Deus super omnia benedictus in commune*: God over all blessed for ever: which Reading is farther from the Socinian Conceit of its being a thanksgiving for Christ, Thus, *who is over all God be blessed for ever*, than our Translation is. From this

because all Scriptures must be taken properly; unless that sense doth contradict some other Scripture; which is not in the case before us, because no Text saith the Son did not, or that the Father only did create the World.

2. Since the Son was before the world, he must be from Eternity; because the Scriptures no where suggest a creation between Eternity and Time: But on the contrary, *Moses* declares that the creation of the World was *the beginning*, viz. of the creature, and consequently there could be no creature before it. Whence in the Scripture-Phrase to be in the beginning, that is, before the world; and to be from Eternity, are the same thing. For wisdom doth thus express her Eternal Existence, *Prov.* 8. 22, 23. *He possessed me in the beginning of his ways, before his works of old. I was set up from everlasting, from the beginning, or ever the earth was: and v.* 24, 25. *when there were no depths, I was brought forth; when there were no Fountains abounding with water: before the mountains were settled, before the Hills was I brought forth. Thus to be in the beginning, and to be before the world, are Phrases,*
which

which the Spirit uses to express the Eternal existence of wisdom: but the Son was in the beginning, *Joh. 1. 1.* he was before all things, *Colos. 1. 17.* and before the world, *Joh. 17. 5.* therefore the same Phrases must as well express the Eternal existence of the Son too.

If the Son then was any where called a creature, it must be restrained to his man-hood, as his descent from *Abraham* is, *Rom. 9. 5.* it was *κατὰ οὐρανόν* as to the flesh: which restriction must imply that there is something excepted, as to which he is no creature; and as to which he did not descend from *Abraham*; which can be no other than the Divine Nature: whence the next words say, he is over all God blessed for ever. *Irenaeus* 1. 3 c. 18. reads it thus, *Ex quibus Christus secundum carnem, qui est Deus super omnes benedictus in saecula.* Of whom Christ was according to the Flesh, who is God over all blessed for ever: and *Tert. adv. Prax. c. 13.* thus, -- who is *Deus super omnia benedictus in aeternum*: God over all blessed for ever: which Reading is farther from the Socinian Conceit of its being a thanksgiving for Christ, Thus, *who is over all God be blessed forever*, than our Translation is. From this

this Text, which the *Socinians* have so miserably disguised, not these Fathers only, but the first Ages of Christianity too, have always pleaded the Divinity of the Son.

He continues his Argument || from 1 Cor. 3. 32. *Christ is God's* : that is (saith he) God's Subject; and this he fancies must be God's creature.

Ans. Why not God's Son, since the Scriptures so often call him so? but if it must be [God's Subject] yet it can do him no Service: For he is his Subject in regard of his Humane Nature, and Offices: Nay, his Subordination to the Father, as Son; the Apostle (as we shall show) calls a *Subjection*: which will appear to be so far from affecting his Divinity, that it gives light, and strength, to this Doctrine.

He cites *Mat.* 12. 17, 18. *behold my Servant*.

His Argument lyeth thus, p. 5. *If Christ were God, it could not without blasphemy be (absolutely, and without restriction) affirmed of him, that he is the servant of God.*

Ans. It is not affirmed of him absolutely, and without restriction, but in reference to his Humane Nature, and

Offices;

Offices: and till the Socinian doth prove that it is absolutely affirmed of him, i. e. that Christ is in all respects a Servant, and not in some only; it hath not so much as the face of an Argument.

His next Scripture is *Phil. 2. 8, 9. he humbled himself, and became obedient to death, therefore God hath highly exalted him.*

Ans. His obedience to death, doth indeed prove that he is man, for else he could not dye: this we all grant: but neither this, nor his Exaltation can ever prove he is not God, which is the thing in controversie. The truth of this will appear from our explication of his next Scripture, which is,

1 Cor. 15. 28. Then shall the son also be subject to him, who put all things under him. Which subjection he conceits destroys his Divinity.

Ans. [Then] shall the Son be subject; that is, at the end of the world, v. 24. which implies that till then he is in some respect not subject; which is a demonstration of his Divinity. For all creatures are in all points his Subjects; therefore if there is any one respect, in which the Son is not subject, then the Son must be God.

Now his non-subjection is this, that
this now

now he hath a Kingdom, viz. The Church given by the Father, in which he reigns himself as Mediator, whence *V. 25. He must reign.* This Kingdom the Church is separate from the Dominion of the Father, which is the World: Therefore so far as he reigns in this Kingdom, so far he reigns separate from the Father, and that is *not subject* to him. Hence he saith, *Matt. 28. 18. All Power is given me: Phil. 2. 9. God hath highly exalted him;* and again *Psal. 2. 9. I have set my King upon my holy Hill of Sion.* But at the end of the World, *He shall deliver up this Kingdom to the Father, V. 24.* And then he shall reign no otherwise than as subordinate to the Father, as Son; which the Text expresses by [*subject to the Father*]. Whence it must be granted, that when he saith, *the Father commands and sends me, &c.* These were spoken, and ought to be understood, antecedent to this exaltation.

To close this Argument. On the one hand this exaltation proves no more than this, That the Son hath now a Kingdom, which he had not before; but it doth not prove that he did not reign before with the Father in the Government of the World: And on the other hand, this

this subjection proves that the Son shall resign this Kingdom, but it doth not prove, he shall not reign with the Father for ever: Because this subjection is not a subjection of the creature to God, but a subordination of one Person to another in the Sacred Trinity.

Argum. 3. P. 6, 7. The true God is not the Minister, or Priest of any other. But Christ is the minister, and Mediator of God, and Men; Heb. 8. 6. He hath obtained a more excellent Ministry: ch. 2. 17. He is a faithful High-Priest.---

Ans. These Texts respect not his Nature, but his Offices; and therefore do not deny his Divinity. For the same Apostle applies to him those Scriptures, which can be spoke of none but God; as *Psal. 45. 6, 7. Thy Throne, O God, is for ever, and ever: Which Heb. 5. 8. declares that God spoke of his Son: And Psal. 102. 25. Thou hast laid the foundations of the Earth; and the Heavens are the work of thy hands: This also V. 10. applies to the Son.*

These Texts are sufficiently vindicated by the learned Dean of *St. Paul's*, *Dr. Sherlock*, who shows that this word *by God* is not a Nominate, and therefore is not spoke of the Father

Father, as the *Sociinians*, and particularly this Letter from *Enicdinus*, would have it; who render it [God is thy Throne] *Id est* The Father is a Throne to the Son. But it is an Attick Votive, and consequently can be spoke of no other than the Son, whom it styles [God] and to whom it ascribes an Everlasting Dominion. As the other Psalm doth the creation of the World. Those very *Sociinians*, who have read this answer, do yet still insist upon their own sence, without taking any notice of that answer, which is an evident Argument they do not pursue the discovery of Truth; but only serve their own Hypothesis.

Ensch. & Epist. Evang. 101. 102. 103. 104. 105. argues the same thing from the *Hebrew*, and *Aquila's* Version. And sure I am that from hence the Apostolick Ages did always assert the Divinity of the Son. Thus *Iust. M. Dial. Terod. alio. Prax.* c. 7. *Orig. con. Cels. l. 1. Cyr. adv. Judas. &c.* And certainly since each Testament, viz. the Old in its Doctrine, and the New in the express application of it to the Son, do jointly proclaim this Minister, this Priest to be God, as well as man, the *Sociinians* must be extremely unjust in pleading the one in contradiction on to the other. He

He insists, *The true God cannot Mediate or Intercede, but Christ Intercedes, 1 Tim. 2. 5. There is one God and Mediator — the Man Christ Jesus.*

They object elsewhere, that Christ the Mediator is here Distinguished from God, *there is one God, and one Mediator*, whence they presume this Mediator cannot be God.

Ans. The Mediator is distinguished from God, not simply, because (as we shall prove) himself is God: But only *secundum quid*, as Mediator; for as such he not only is both God and Man; but also by his Mediatorship stands between both, in order to the reconciling both together; and consequently, must be distinct from both. But that this Mediator is God as well as Man, will appear:

1. From the Sense of Antiquity, and the Judgment of the Church in all Ages, which ever held that the Mediator must be *utrinque particeps*, Partaker of both Natures, that there may be some equality between the Mediator, and the Persons between whom he mediates, to the end he may the more powerfully reconcile both together. Upon which bottom

Irenaeus, who was Disciple to *Polycarp*, as *Polycarp* was to *St. John* the Evangelist. *l. 3. c. 20.* thus, *admirat hominem Deo*; whence *Theodoret*, *Dialog. 2.* *homo... ad Deum... est*, he hath United Man to God. And,

2. From the Nature of his Mediatorary Kingdom, which requires Omnipotence, whereby he may be able to support and govern it: and Omniscience, whereby he may know all the wants and circumstances of it. Therefore since the Nature of this Kingdom of Christ doth require infinite perfections, which are incompatible to a Creature, it doth evidently declare the Deity of this Mediator; who is accordingly not only stiled God, but hath likewise the incommunicable Name, *viz. Jehovah*, and Perfections of God ascribed to him in the Scriptures.

3. The design of this Text is not to declare that the Father only is God exclusive of the Son, and the Holy Ghost; but to teach us that there is but one God, and one Mediator exclusive of the many Gods, and many Mediators, acknowledged by the Gentiles. But still (notwithstanding

withstanding any thing in this Text) this Mediator may be with the Holy Ghost One God with the Father. They have therefore brought a Text to disprove our Doctrine, which neither as to Letter, or design, makes any thing against us.

But this Letter pleads, that God cannot mediate, but Christ doth, therefore Christ cannot be God.

Ans. We grant that God cannot intercede with the Creature, because this would imply that he is neither Almighty, nor All-sufficient; but the Son may intercede with the Father without bringing his Divinity into question.

Therefore (to put the *Socinian* into a right method of dispute, which he yet seems totally a stranger to, there being nothing proper and concluding in all his Arguments) let him prove that in this Text these words [One God] are spoke exclusive of the Son; and that the Son's Intercession with the Father is inconsistent with his Divinity: This is to his purpose, and must be done, or else he must give up this Text, and indeed his Cause together.

His Argument is fallacious; for it applies that to God in reference to the Creature, which we apply to one Person in the God-head in reference to another; and lyes thus, God cannot pray to the Creature, therefore the Son cannot pray to the Father: a *Socinian* Argument indeed, which all men else would be ashamed of.

But it is said [the man Christ Jesus] true, but this is not simply man, but man united to the eternal word, or Son of God. So [the man Jesus Christ] suffered for us; but there was such an Union between the two Natures, that what was suffered by the One, was imputed to the other; whence, *Act. 20. 28. We are purchased by the Blood of God*, that is, by the Blood of Christ united to the second Person in the glorious Trinity. This Text *Tertullian ad Uxor. l. 2. c. 3.* quotes without any *Anti-Trinitarian* gloss upon it; and indeed these blasphemous Interpretations now in use with these men, were utterly unknown to the Apostolick Ages.

Argum. 4 p. 7, 8. *God doth all things in his own Name, and by his own Authority;*

rity; he ever doth his own Will: and seeks his own Glory: but Christ saith, John 17. 28. I am not come of my self: John 5. 43. I am come in my Father's Name: John 5. 30. I seek not my own Will: and ch. 8. 50. I seek not my own Glory.

Ans. This is true of God in reference to the Creature; but it is not true of one Person in the Trinity in reference to another. For though God cannot come in the Name, and by the Authority of a Creature, yet the Son may come in the Name, and by the Authority of the Father: because, though the Son is equal to the Father as God, yet the Father is greater than the Son, as Father. For which reason *Episcopus*, whom this Letter bespatters for an *Arian*, *Institut. Theol.* l. 4. c. 32. saith, That the Son refers all things to the Father, as the Fountain of the Deity; of, and from whom the Son is. By this he rejects a Co-ordination, but asserts a Subordination of Persons in the Trinity: and therefore at the same time both ruins these Objections, and also establishes the Doctrine of a Trinity.

He proceeds; God declares himself to be the prime object of Faith and Worship; but the Son doth not so, for *John 12. 44. He that believes on me, believes not on me, but on him that sent me.*

Ans. Christ doth in this very Text propose himself as the object of Faith and Worship; for he saith, *He that believes on me*, which asserts that men did believe on him, and implys that they ought to do so; what follows is but a qualification of the thing suitable to his subordination to his Father; for such an one believes *not on me*, that is, solely, or ultimately: but *on him that sent me*, i. e. on him, as well as me; by which he doth not exclude, but include himself with the Father, as the object of Faith and Worship. This sense must be allowed, else you run into these two absurdities, *viz.*

1. You make the first clause assert, what the second denyes; and the second deny what the first asserts, *viz.* That men do believe on him, and yet do not believe on him: they do not believe, and yet they believe still.

2. These

2. These Scriptures, which make Faith in Christ a condition of Salvation, such as *John 3. 36. He that believes on the Son, hath Everlasting Life*; must be razed out of our Bibles.

But perhaps he may trifle upon that word [prime] object, which hath nothing in it. For if the Father be the prime object as he is the first Person in the Trinity; yet the Father, Son and Holy Ghost, are the One, and only object in regard of Nature.

But as the Texts, he here quotes, cannot serve his Hypothesis, so there is One among them, that totally destroys it, viz. *John 8. 42. I proceeded forth, and came from God*: that is, I am not from the Earth, but from Heaven: this is the Apostles sense, *Ephes. 4. 9. That he ascended, what is it, but that he descended first?* Whence he did not first ascend to receive his Doctrine and Authority from God, as Socinus dreams; but he first descended from God, with whom he was in the beginning, *John 1. 1. and with whom he was glorified before the World, John 17. 5.* Our sense falls in with variety of Scriptures, which on every side

confirm and support it: but their labours with endless difficulties in wrestling and perverting them; that is an Argument of truth, but this of falshood.

Argum. 5. pa. 9. *God was always most wise, but Christ increased in Wisdom, Luke 2. 52.*

Ans^r. The Text saith, he increased in *Wisdom* and *Stature*, which word [*Stature*] suits not a Divine Nature, but an Human Body, which shews that the Text speaks of him, not simply, as if in his whole Capacity, without any exception, he increased in Wisdom, but only as Man, and consequently this Text proves he is Man; but doth not prove he is not God, which is the design of this Argument. This is a demonstration of a studied corruption of the truth; for (like the Devil) he quotes but one part of the Text, to the end he may pervert the whole.

He proceeds, *God was never ignorant of any thing*; but he makes it that Christ was ignorant of two:

1. Of the place where *Lazarus* was buried, *John 11. 34 Where have ye laid him?*

Ans^r.

Ans^r. This no more proves that he knew not the place, than Gods asking *Cain*, Gen. 4. 9. *Where is Abel thy Brother*, doth prove that God knew not what was become of him? How can we presume he was ignorant of this, who of himself knew both his death, and the time of it too. That he would not in every thing give demonstrations of his Divinity, is no argument against it.

2. He pleads that Christ knew not the day of Judgment, for *Mark* 13. 32. *Of that day knows no Man* (in the Greek tis [*is tis*] none knows) no not the Angels—neither the Son, but the Father. *St. Matthew*, ch. 24. 36. adds, *but the Father only*.

Ans^r. He knew it not as Man; but this doth not prove, he is not God, and did not know it as such. For *John* 3. 17. *He knew all things*, and therefore must know this, or this must be nothing. In *1 King* 8. 39. *God only knows the Hearts of Men*; but *John* 2. 25. *Christ knew what is in Man*: But to know the Hearts of Men, and to know what is in Man, are the same in Sense; therefore Christ knows what God only knows; and consequently

ly Christ must be God, and for that cause Omniscient. Revel. 2. 23. *I am he who search the Heart.* This Let. 4. p. 154. doth acknowledge that Christ spoke of himself. But this (as we know) is proper to God, who alone can search the Heart: Therefore our Savior's Application of it to himself, is a Manifest Assertion of his own Divinity, and consequently of his Omniscience, which is inseparable from the Divine Nature. Whence it must be that he knew it not as Man only, but yet at the same time must know it as God.

But here the Socinian pleads, that he knew many things not of himself, but by Communication from the Father, as the Prophets did, 2 Kings 8. 12. *I have the Evil that thou wilt do to the Children of Israel.* Therefore some extraordinary Knowledges in Christ, do speak his knowledge no more Omniscient and laberous, than that of the Prophets. So to this purpose p. 155. *These are very unlike Cases.* For *this Prophet knew this Man, so far as concerned his future Dealing towards this People: But this doth not*
 prove,

prove, that he knew this Man any farther, or any other Man at all. Whereas *Joh. 2. 24. Christ knew all Man, and vi. 2. 9. He knew what was in Man*; and therefore all that is in Man: Which never was affirmed of any of the Prophets. From which alone it appears, that his Knowledge was much more extensive than any of the Prophets.

2. He knew all things *Joh. 2. 17.* which imports an infinite Knowledge; But an infinite Knowledge can never be Communicated to a finite Understanding: Because there is an infinite Disproportion between the faculty and the object: Therefore the Knowledge which Christ had, speaks him infinite, and that is God.

3. This Hypothesis, viz. that such a Knowledge can be Communicated to a Creature, doth confound the Essential properties of God, and the Creature, because it makes the Creature infinite, as well as the Creator, and

4. Our Saviour saith, *Revel. 2. 23. I am he who search the Heart*: Which Phrase [search the Heart] was never applied to any of the Prophets; but on-
ly

ly to Father, Son and Holy Ghost: Yet he saith, not only *I* do it, but *I am* he that do it; which is more Emphaticall, and implies, that this is his own Act, and consequently, that his Knowledge of the Heart, is from his own self. Therefore his Knowledge was not like the Prophets; for their's was Finite, but his Infinite: Their's Communicated, his Inherent.

For which Reasons, as well as others, Antiquity put that Sense upon these Texts, which might not deny, but establish not his Omniscience only, but such as is not Communicated, but Inherent too: For *Greg. Naz. Ora. 36. Athanas. tom. 1. Contr. Ar. Ora. 4. &c.* he knows this day *Θεός* as God: And consequently must know it of himself; but he knew it not, *ἡρώδης* as Man; hereby making those words [none knows] to exclude not what is God, and therefore not the Son as God; but all the Creatures, and therefore the Son as Man.

In the same Sense must we take that of *St. Matthew Ch. 24. 36. of that Day, and Hour, knows no Man, no, not the Angels of Heaven, but my Father only.* For here

here [Father] must not be taken personally for the Father, in opposition to the Son, and the Holy Ghost: But essentially for God the Father, Son and Holy Ghost, in opposition to that word [Man] of that Day and Hour, knows no Man — but the Father only; therefore these words [the Father only] exclude the Son from this Knowledge as Man, but not as God. This exposition is cleared, and confirmed from hence.

1. That in the Scriptures [Father] doth often signifie God essentially, including, Son and Holy Ghost, who are of, and from, the Father.

2. This Sense must be granted, else you make this one Text, to contradict all those which say the Son knows *all things*. &c. and

3. These Exclusive Particles [none] knows, or the Father [only] i. e. God [only] knows: Must be so interpreted in divers places of Scripture, as particularly *Luk. 10. 22. No Man* [in the Greek it is here also *is* none] *knows who the Son is but the Father*, or the Father only. Whence they may as well exclude the Holy Ghost from the Knowledge of the Son,

Son; as the Son from knowing the Day of Judgment; because this Particle [none] must be as Exclusive in that Text, as in this. But this Word cannot Exclude the Holy Ghost from the knowledge of the Son, because 1 Cor. 2. 10. *The Spirit searches all things, even the deep things of God: Which word [search] doth imply, that this Knowledge is perfect, and from himself, when applyed to the Spirit, as well as when applyed to the Father in the searching the Heart: And consequently by parity of Reason, it cannot Exclude the Son from the Knowledge of that Day.*

Therefore when I find these Texts cited by the Socinians, confining these Knowledges to God; and yet meet with others, which ascribe infinite Knowledge to the Son, and the Holy Ghost, I must conclude, not that the Son and Holy Ghost, are either ignorant of some things, for then I must contradict those Texts, which say they know all things, or that they are Creatures indowed with an infinite Knowledge; because this (as is Disputed already) is utterly impossible: But I must conclude they are
God;

God; and therefore are not Excluded by those Texts, from knowing those things of themselves; but are included with the Father in the God-Head; and therefore are with the Father, that One God, to whom all things are open, and naked.

He proceeds, Christ ascribed the Infalibility of his Judgment to the Father, Joh. 8. 16. *If I Judge; my Judgment is true; for I am not alone, but I and my Father, that sent me:* Which he thinks an Argument against his Divinity.

Ans. *I am not alone, but I and my Father* — that is, the Father hath not left me alone, but bears witness to me by Miracles. This speaks not the insufficiency of his Judgment, but the incredulity of this People, and the abundant means, that he vouchsafed them. Whence he so often appeals to his Works Joh. 10. 25. *The Works that I do in my Fathers Name, they testifie of me, and v. 38. though ye believe not me, yet believe the Works.* Therefore this proves the Grace of God the Father, but doth not disprove the Divinity of the Son. He insists, God cannot be tempted; *Jam.*

John. 1. 17. but the Son was Tempted of the Devil.

Ans. If God cannot be Tempted; what is the meaning of *Mat. 4. 7.* Jesus said—*thou shalt not Tempt the Lord thy God.* *See James* saith, God cannot be Tempted with, or to evil; No more was our Blessed Saviour; for he complied not with the Temptation.

Hieros. Loke 18. 19. Why callest thou me Good. There is none good, save One, that is God. On which the Letter saith, he refused to be called Good, because God only is Good.

Ans. The true meaning is, he refused to be called good, unless in Relation to his Divinity, implying that himself is good; not by Participation, as Man is; but essentially as God is: Therefore he asks; why callest thou me good, viz. as Man, or as God? That sense he Rejects, this he claims as his due. So *Athanas.*

Tom. 1. de Hum. Nat. Suscept. in quæ quædam deus non potest esse, xai x' Ode, xai me nize x' yabdr. If you think me Man, and not God, call me not good. Suppose this Text is of it self capable of those two senses, the one of which speaks him
but

but Man, the other God: Wee may easily determine which Sense to take it in; for their's contradicts all those Scriptures, which declare his Divinity: But our's comports with them, without Contradiction to any: Therefore not their's, but our's must be admitted, because it must be interpreted in concurrence with other Scriptures, but not in contradiction to 'em.

Arg. 6. p. 10. God gives what, and to whom he pleases, but Christ saith, to Sit on my right Hand, and on my left — Is not mine to give, Mat. 20. 23.

Ans. Is not mine to give, &c. as Man, not mine Exclusive of the Father, or contrary to the Divine Oeconomy, according to which, something is ascribed as peculiar to every Person in the Sacred Trinity. That this is the meaning, is evident from Job. 10. 18. I give unto them Eternal Life. Nothing can be greater than this, yet the Son gives this, as well as the Father. Therefore in what Sense the other is not his to give, in the same Sense Eternal Life is not his to give. But in what Sense he gives Eternal Life, in the same Sense he gives the other too, whatever you please to understand by it. This they know from Doctrine, and therefore ought not only to propose
mon **E** *this*

this Scripture, but also to prove an inconsistency between this Scripture, and this Doctrine: This he doth not attempt, nor will ever be able to perform. But it seems it is enough for a Socinian to start an Error, and then leave it to the World, in hope some may take it, as the Man did the Snake, into their House.

He proceeds, God needs no aid of any other, but Christ saith, *be that sent me, is with me.*

Ans. The thing in Controversie is, whether the Son be God, as well as Man: The Socinian brings this Text against us; but if we at present only suppose that he is both, which we must do till it be disproved, he can never tell me, why the Fathers presence with the Human Nature of Christ should necessarily imply a denial of his Divine Nature; and consequently this Text is, *no dum Medium*, whence to conclude his point.

He adds, *God cannot Pray for himself, and People, but Christ Prays for himself and Disciples.* Luk. 22. 32. Heb. 5. 7. &c.

Ans. We Teach that Christ is both God and Man; Now he Prayed for himself, only as Man, Luk. 22. 32. that his Cup, &c. his Passion, now as Man, might pass
from

from him. He Prayed for others, as Priest, Heb. 5. 6. *Thou art a Priest for ever*, whence *2. 7.* in the days of his Flesh — he offered up Prayers: Whence the Socinian thinks he cannot be God, that is to say, his Praying must hinder the Human Nature from being united to the Divine; for which he can produce neither Scripture nor Reason. Nay, as Man he dyed, yet notwithstanding this was United to the Divinity: And if his Death could not hinder this Union, much less can his Praying.

But to shew the weakness of this Argument, we will add, though he cannot Pray considered Essentially as God; for so there is nothing above him, yet he may Pray considered personally, as the Son of God, viz. the Father; for as Son, he is Subordinate to the Father, and consequently as Son may Pray the Father. This is an Argument then no more to his purpose, than if he had told us a Story of Abraham's Travels, or Noah's Planting a Vineyard.

He urges farther, *Christ Dyed, and the Father raised him from the Dead*, Ephes. 1. 10, 20: Whence also he fancies he cannot be God.

He that dyed, and was raised, must be Man; but his Argument implies, that he who raised him, must be God, which is

enough to our purpose: For he raised himself, *John 2. 19. destroy this Temple, and in three days I will raise it up*; which v. 21. saith, he spake of the Temple of his Body. Therefore (according to his own Hypothesis) the Son must be God, as well as Man.

But the Socinian pretends, *Ler. 3. p. 89. That Christ raised his Body by a Power communicated to him by the Father*; and accordingly his being raised is always attributed to the Father, not to himself.

Ans. This is false; for that Text doth attribute it to himself, *I will raise it up*. Therefore either the Son must be the Father; or else his Resurrection is not always attributed to the Father.

2. If he was raised by a power solely from the Father, then he must be raised by the Father: for he raises the dead by whose Power the dead is raised; and consequently he could not say, *I will raise it*.

3. This notion makes the Raiser, and the raised, to be the same: which is as incongruous as to speak the Maker, and the thing made to be the same. Therefore when he saith, *I will raise it up*, he speaks not as Man, for as such he was to be raised: but as God, who alone is the raiser of the dead. And, 4. The

4. The ascription of it to the Father doth not deny the co operation of the Son: as the ascription of it to the Son doth not deny the co-operation of the Father; for then those Texts, of which some ascribe it to the Father, others to the Son, must be contradictory. But the ascription of it to both doth declare the Divinity of both, because now both must be God, or else they could not raise the dead.

His next Scripture, which is *Mat. 28. 18. All Power is given me*; is already answered in *Arg. 2.* For this Power here given him respects only the Government of the Church, to which he was now exalted; which the Psalmist expresses by setting him a King on the Holy Hill of *Sion*: but this doth not prove that he had not, antecedent to this, a Power with the Father in the Government of the World. This proves he had now a new Government, but doth not prove that therefore he was not God: because the Father had a new Government upon the Creation of the World, but yet was God. Such additional prove an alteration in the things added, but not in those Divine Persons, to whom they are added. All the difference is, this Power was given the Son. True, but this (as before)

fore) speaks the Son subordinate to the Father, but doth not destroy his Nature, by which he is God.

Argum. 7. p. 11. *Christ in the Scriptures is always spoken of as a distinct and different Person from God: and is described to be the Son of God, and the Image of God.*

Ans. He is personally distinct, and therefore is not God the Father: but he is not essentially distinct, and therefore must be God the Son. If the Socinian then would gain his point, he must prove not only [a] distinction, which we grant: but [such] a distinction, which we deny.

But he hath said that Christ is the Son of God, and the Image of God; whence he concludes, p. 12. thus, it is as impossible that the Son, or Image of the one true God, should himself be that One true God; as that the Son should be the Father, and the Image be the very thing, whose Image it is.

Ans. Profoundly argued, and like a Socinian! For he falsely supposes that the Father only is the One true God: when Father, Son, and Holy Ghost are together the one true God. Therefore take the One true God, and the invisible God, personally for the Father only; and we grant that the Son of that One true God cannot be that

that One true God, because the Son cannot be the Father: and that the Image of the invisible God cannot be the invisible God, because (as he saith) the Image cannot be that very thing, whose Image it is.

But take the *One true God*, and the *invisible God*, essentially for Father, Son and Holy Ghost, and then the Son with the Father, and Holy Spirit, is that One true God: and the Image of the invisible God, with the Father and Holy Ghost, is that invisible God; because all three Persons together are the one true and invisible God.

Now the Son is called the *Image of the invisible God*, because as an Image represents that very thing, whose Image it is, so the Son represents the Father, as having in himself all the perfections of the Father flowing from the same Essence common to both. Whence he saith, *John 14. 8. He that hath seen me, hath seen the Father*; because as *Hilar. Pict. Epist. de Trin. l. 9. gloses*, the Father is seen in the Perfections of the Son; and consequently the Son must be of the same Nature with the Father.

Our Doctrine then is not simply impossible, and contradictory as some say, as the *Luther* pretends: But therein is palpably

false, and absurd; for all these Arguments (as he calls them) run upon these two false suppositions; viz.

1. That there is but one Nature in Christ: for he proves that Christ is Man, and thence concludes he cannot be God; when the Scriptures abundantly declare that he is both.

2. That there is but one Person in the God-head: for he often proves that Christ is not God, viz. the Father, as many of his quotations must be understood; and thence concludes he is not God; though the Scriptures prove that Father, Son and Holy Ghost are God.

Thus he supposes what we deny, that there is but one Nature in Christ, and but one Person in the God-head; but proves only what we grant, viz. that Christ is Man, and that the Son is not the Father.

But let him prove first that there is but one Nature in Christ, and then that Christ is Man; and again, first that there is but one Person, viz. the Father in the God-head; and then that the Son is not the Father; from each of which it will follow that the Son cannot be God: nothing less can conclude his point; but this method of his proves nothing against us, but only

betrays the *Socinians* want either of Honesty or Judgment.

However, he concludes his Arguments (as he calls them) with a *Socinian* Confidence; asserting, p. 13. that there is in Scripture no real foundation for the Divinity of the Son. For proof of which he now flies above common Argument, and can stoop to nothing below Demonstration.

§. Demonstr. 1. par. 8. p. 13.— So many Scriptures expressly declare, that only the Father is God. For proof of this he quotes, John 17. 1. & Father — this is Eternal Life, that they might know thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ, whom thou hast sent.

Ans. The Letter saith, that Only the Father is God, which denies the Son, and Holy Ghost is God: but this Text saith, the Father is the only true God: this excludes the Gentile Gods, but not the Son, and the Holy Ghost, who with the Father are the only true God. He here removes the exclusive particle [only] from the prædicate, the [true God] to the subject [thee] for (pardon the repetition) the Apostle saith — *that the only true God*; but the *Socinian* saith, *only thou the true God*; which is such a corruption of the Text contrary to all ancient

and

and authentick reading, that utterly perverts the very sense and design of it.

You have then a Demonstration indeed, not that *only the Father is God*, but that the Scriptures and *Socinianism* are at odds; and that the one or the other must be Reformed.

The next words [and Jesus Christ, whom thou hast sent] do Distinguish the Son from the Father as to Office; to doth 1. Cor. 8. 6. there is *but one God* — and *One Lord*; but they do not Distinguish him as to Nature. The same is true of other Quotations under this Head; and consequently none of them prove what he undertakes, viz. that only the Father is God.

Demonst. 2. para. 9. p. 14. If Christ were God as well as Man, it had been altogether Superfluous to give the Holy Ghost to his said Human Nature as a Director, and a Guide: For what other help could that Nature need, which was one Person with (as they speak) God the Son; and in which God the Son did personally dwell?

His Quotations are Luke 4. 1. Act. 1. 2. and Ch. 10. 38. Which prove only this; that the Holy Ghost was given to the Human Nature of Christ: Which the poor Man thinks a Demonstrative proof, that Christ

Christ was not United to the Eternal Word, or Son of God, and Consequently was not God.

1. This Demonstration (as he calleth) is founded not upon Scripture, but upon a *Socinian* Presumption. For no Scripture saith, that if the Son was God, he should not have had the Presence and Conduct of the Spirit of God. And certainly it is a Monstrous way of Arguing, that this or that is necessary for God to have done, or not to have done, and then to conclude, he hath, or hath not done it. For this is no better, than to limit the Almighty, to give Rules to Infinite Wisdom, and to make not the Scripture, but our own blind Conceits, the Rule of our Faith. In this way the *Romanists* Demonstrate an Universal Head of the Church: Some the Divine Right of this, or that Form of Church-Government; and after the same Methods, others may as well Demonstrate away all Religion, and introduce what they please of their own.

2. His Foundation is utterly false. For the Church is the Body of Christ, which *Ephes. 4. 15, 16.* is said to be *firmly joyned to him* our Head, to intimate that he doth animate, and guide it, and yet notwithstanding

standing this, the Spirit is sent to lead her into all Truth. Where let the *Socinian* tell me, why both the Son of God, and the Holy Spirit, may not guide the Human Nature, as well as the Mystical Body of Christ?

It follows, that the same works of God are ascribed now to one Person, then to another. Thus we find it in this of Conduct, in that of Creation, &c. but this doth not destroy, but rather declare and confirm the Doctrine of a Trinity: Because it proclaims those Powers and Operations, which the *Socinian* would Limit to one Person, to be common to all three; whence it follows, that all three must be God.

Doubt 3. parag. 10 p. 15. We have an Instance of this in the Demonstration now before us. For he would not have the Son to be God, because he Ascribes his Miracles to the Holy Spirit, Mat. 12. 28. *I cast out Devils by the Spirit of God.* Now this doth not prove the Son is not God, any more than the Ascribing Creation to the Son, doth prove that the Father did not Create. But it is a good step toward the proving that the Holy Ghost is God. For Miracles cannot be wrought but by a Divine Power, there-

therefore if the Holy Ghost hath such a Power of Miracles, that they are wrought by him, if he be a Person which we shall easily prove, he must be a Divine Person, and that is God.

Demonst. 4. parag. 11. p. 15. *Had our Lord been more than a Man, the Prophecies of the Old Testament would not Describe him barely as the Seed of the Woman.*

Ans^r. They Describe him as such, but not barely as such, for they Describe him also as God. Thus Isa. 40. 3. *Prepare ye the way of the Lord, make strait in the Desert an High way for our God.* This is evidently spoke of the *Messias*, and the Evangelists with one consent, apply it to Christ, *Mat. 3. 3. Mark 1, 2, 3. Luk. 3, 4. and Joh. 1. 23.* Where they all agree, that the Voice in the Wilderness, was the *Baptist*; and that the way he was to prepare, was the way of the *Messias*; therefore according to their Application of Scripture, the Prophet doth stile the Son, the Lord our God.

Observe farther, that this Text calls the *Messias* Lord, in the Hebrew, it is *Jebozab*, which (we shall prove) is an Incommunicable Name of God, which therefore Asserts the Divinity of him, to whom it is applied. And consequently the Prophet in this

this place declares him to be God in a proper Sense.

Compare *Psal.* 46. 6, 7. with *Heb.* 1. 8. and *Psal.* 102. 25. with *Heb.* 1. 10. and you will find, that according to the Apostle's Application of those Texts, the *Psalmist* Ascribes to the Son, an Everlasting Throne, and the Creation of the World; and certainly this Describes him not as the Seed of the Woman, but as God.

§. 4. This Pen having thus attack'd the Divinity of the Son, now turns it self against that of the Holy Ghost; affirming *P. 16.* that the Holy Ghost — is only the Power and Inspiration of God, at least is not himself God, which they hold is ascertain'd by these Considerations.

Consid. 1. The Holy Ghost or Spirit, and the Power of God, are spoken of as one and the same thing, *1 Cor.* 2. 4, 5. *Luke* 1. 35. *Ch.* 1. 13. 20. *Mat.* 12. 28. *Luk.* 9. 49. Compared with *Act.* 1. 4, 5.

Ans. He is here to prove, that the Holy Ghost is only the Power and Inspiration of God, but is not himself God, but these Texts say no such thing, and consequently do not ascertain this Position.

2. The Blessed Spirit is not properly the Inspiration of God, but something distinct from

from it. For 1 Cor. 12. 8, 9, 10. *Wisdom, Faith, &c.* are given by the Spirit: Whence Heb. 2. 4. they are called the *Gifts of the Holy Ghost*. Hence each Text Distinguishes between the Spirit, and these Gifts: But neither of them are the Inspiration of God. For Inspiration is the Act, whereby the Holy Ghost Conveys these Gifts to Men, which 1. 11. is called *a dividing* them.

This is clear from 2 Tim. 3. 16. all Scripture is *God-breathed*, or *given by the Inspiration of God*. Here Scripture is the gift or thing inspired. God is the giver or inspirer; therefore Inspiration can be but the Act, whereby it is given or Inspired. Therefore as the Graces before mentioned, viz. *Wisdom, Faith, &c.* are the Gifts of the Holy Ghost, so the Holy Ghost, must give them by way of Inspiration. The Socinian then doth here confound the Agent and the Act, making the Giver and the Giving, the same thing; which is as false and absurd, as to say my Act of Donation is my Person.

3. He Asserts, that the Holy Ghost is only the *Power of God*, that is, as he often explains himself, is neither God, nor a Person. But this is neither proved, nor ever can be; because such Power can know no more of God, than a Grace or Virtue can do,

do, which are qualities, not persons: But
 1. Cor. 2. 10. The Spirit searches all things,
 even the deep things of God: Whence the
 Spirit must be not a simple Power, but a
 Person endowed with an infinite knowledge,
 and that can be no other than God.

What the Letter opposes, the Scriptures
 are clear in; for Act. 5. Ananias did lye to
 the Holy Ghost, whence v. 4. saith, he lyed
 not to Man, but to God. Therefore the Ho-
 ly Ghost must be God.

Emendatus, who is much more Manly in
 his performances, than this *Epistler* Parallels
 this of *Ananias*, lying to the Holy Ghost,
 and to God, with the *Jews* Rejecting *Samu-
 el* and God: Thus, the *Jews* Rejected *Sam-
 uel* immediately, who was set over them;
 but they Rejected God mediately, who
 did set *Samuel* over them: So *Ananias* ly-
 ed to the Holy Ghost immediately, who
 was given to the Apostles: But he lyed to
 God mediately, who gave the Holy
 Ghost to the Apostles; whence as the *Jews*
 did Sin differently against *Samuel* and God,
viz. immediately, and mediately, so did
Ananias against the Holy Ghost and God,
 whence he would have the Holy Ghost and
 God, as much distinct, as *Samuel* and God;
 and that is essentially.

Ans.

Ans. That place as put by the Objectors is not parallel with this: For that saith they Rejected not *Samuel*, but God; but this doth not say, that *Ananias* lyed not to the Holy Ghost, but to God. Therefore this Text doth not distinguish between the Holy Ghost, and God, as that doth between *Samuel* and God: And consequently the Holy Ghost and God, are not here made so distinct, as *Samuel* and God.

But take these Texts right, and we may allow a Parallel. But then it must lye between *Samuel* and *Peter*; and again between God and the Holy Ghost; thus the *Jews* thought they Rejected *Samuel* only, as *Ananias* thought he lyed to *Peter* only; but saith God to *Samuel*; they Reject not thee, but me: And saith *Peter* to *Ananias*, thou hast lyed to the Holy Ghost; that is, not to Men, but to God. Therefore while that Text distinguishes between *Samuel* and God, as different, this Unites the Holy Ghost, and God as the same.

Confid. 2. p. 17. A Manifest Distinction is made, as between God and Christ, so also between God and the Holy Ghost: So that 'tis impossible the Spirit should be God himself. His Quotations are, Rom. 5. 5. — the Love

of God is shed abroad in our Hearts, by the Holy Ghost, 1 Cor. 3. 36. — ye are the Temple of God, and the Spirit of God dwells in you, and Rom. 8. 27. He (the Spirit) v. 26. makes intercession for the Saints, according to the Will of God.

Ans. He knows we grant there is a personal Distinction, that as the Son, so the Holy Ghost is not God the Father. This is all these Texts do prove, without which there could not be a Trinity. But none of 'em prove that the Son and Holy Ghost are not God, which is the design of this Consideration.

But because Rom. 8. 27. here quoted, Ascribes Personal Acts to the Holy Ghost — *he makes Intercession*: Therefore, that he may at once destroy his Divinity, and Personality both, he pleads, that the Holy Ghost is spoke of as a Person by the same Figure, that Charity is described as a Person, 1 Cor. 13. 4, 5. The Argument lyes thus, Personal Acts cannot prove the Holy Ghost to be a Person, because they cannot prove that Charity is a Person.

Ans. This doth as effectually destroy the Personality of the Father and the Son, as of the Holy Ghost: For (according to
this

this Argument) Personal Acts do not prove the Father or the Son to be Persons; because they do not prove, that Charity is a Person; but that Argument which proves too much, proves nothing at all.

2. The Scriptures do Ascribe to the Holy Ghost, not only those Personal Acts which they do not to Charity, or to any thing else, which is not a Person: But a Subsistence to the Father, Son and Holy Ghost, together in the same Text 1 John 1. 7. there are three — the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost, implying that the Subsistence of the Holy Ghost is as Real and Personal, as that of the Father, and the Son. They Ascribe to him also Life, Understanding, Will and Power; For 1 Cor. 12. 11. he divides the Manifold Gifts of God, so every one as himself Will: Whence these two Cases are so unlike, that even Middle the Socinian, was ashamed of it. For (notwithstanding this of Charity) he Ascribes the Personality of the Holy Ghost, even while he denies his Divinity.

3. Scripture must not be taken figuratively, without a necessity, else you may turn the whole into an Allegory, and loose at once both the Letter and Design in a

Cabalistical Sense. Now this necessary doth lye in the Case of Charity, as much as in that of the *Anthropomorphites* mentioned, *Let. 4. p. 159.* For all Men do as well know, that Charity can be no Person, as that God can have no Human Parts, as Eyes, Ears, Hands, &c. but this is so far from lying in the Case of the Holy Ghost, that *Let. 3. p. 99.* doth confess, *that all the Arrians, and many Socinians do acknowledge, that the Holy Ghost is a Person.* Whence this is a conceit so weak, as well as Novel, that even the *Unitarians* themselves (as he idly calls them) are divided upon it. It is plain then, that in the Judgment of their own Party, as well as of the Church in all Ages, here is no necessity of a Figurative Interpretation; and consequently no such ought to be admitted. The *Socinian* Arguments (we see) are like Ghosts, that appear only to whom they please, since none but a few of their own Party have yet discerned 'em.

Consid. 3. p. 18. *The Spirit is obtained for us of God by our Prayers, Act. 15. 8. Luk. 11. 13.* Whence he thinks the Spirit is not God, because he is given by another.

Ans.

Ans. By the Spirit he here understands the Gifts of the Spirit; as himself explains it: whence he proceeds thus: *but they, viz. the Socinians, say also, That if the Holy Spirit were at all a Person, much more God, his Gifts——would be bestowed by himself. which,*

1. Convinces him of contradiction: for he saith, they are the gifts of the Spirit, yet denies that they are given by the Spirit: which is as much as to say, they are given by the Spirit, and yet are not given by the Spirit, which is a contradiction in terms. And,

2. This utterly destroys his Argument, which is this, that the Spirit doth not bestow his own gifts, therefore the Spirit is not God, but the Spirit must bestow his own gifts, else they could not be his own gifts, but must be the gifts of him that bestows 'em; therefore the antecedent being false, the consequent must be false too.

Now that the Spirit doth bestow these things, which he acknowledges to be the gifts and graces of the Spirit, is expressly asserted by St. Paul, 1 Cor. 12. 8, 9, 10, 11. where he saith of these very gifts and graces of the Spirit, that the Spirit *divides*

them to every one as he will ; and if he devides 'em to Men, he must give 'em to Men ; because these are Synonymous Terms, which are both expressive of the same thing.

The Texts he quotes, do prove these things are given by the Father, we grant it : but this, and other Texts do prove they are given also by the Spirit ; but those Texts can no more exclude the Spirit, than these can exclude the Father. Therefore they must be given by both, as indeed they are by the whole Trinity ; for which reason they are ascribed now to one Person, then to another ; as *Faith, Repentance, &c.* which are the gifts of the Spirit, are attributed not to the Spirit only, but sometimes to the Father, as himself proves, and sometimes to the Son, as the Apostle declares, *Act. 5. 31. being, viz. the Son hath God exalted — to be a Prince, and a Saviour, to give Repentance* (which implies Faith) *to Israel ; and Act. 2. speaking of the gift of Tongues, saith, v. 32, 33. that Jesus, who was raised from the dead, being by the right hand of God exalted, [he] viz. the same Jesus hath shed forth this, which ye do see and hear.* The result is,

1. That

1. That the Socinian is partial and unjust, in quoting one Text of Scripture in opposition to another; And,

2. He hath not only lost his own Argument, but hath also furnished us with one against himself; for he argues thus, the Spirit doth not give these gifts to men; therefore the Spirit is not God; which implies that if the Spirit doth give these gifts, then the Spirit is God; but (we see) he doth give these gifts, and therefore must be God. And indeed he can be no other than God, who divides these manifold gifts of God according to his own Will.

He proceeds, *there is no Precept, nor Example in all Holy Scripture of Prayer made to the Spirit on this, or any other occasion: which (on the Trinitarian supposition) that the Holy Spirit is a Person, and God; no less than the Father, is very surprising, nay utterly unaccountable.*

Ans. We deny it, for 2 Cor. 13. 16. we read thus; *The Grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the Love of God, and the Communion of the Holy Ghost be with you all;* which Text we shall first explain, and then apply it to the present Argument.

That word [God] *the love of God*, must not be taken essentially for God, as if the Son, and Holy Ghost were not God: but personally for God the Father, and therefore can distinguish them only from the Father. My reasons are these;

1. Other Scriptures (as we have said) do not only stile the Son, and the Holy Ghost God, but do also ascribe to them infinite Perfections, which are not compatible to any Creature; and likewise attribute to them the Name *Jehovah*, which is proper to God, as we shall prove anon. Therefore if you make that word [God] in this Text to signifie God essentially, and consequently to exclude the Son, and Holy Ghost from the Deity; then this Text must contradict all them: but that cannot be the true sense of one Text, which contradicts another. And,

2. St. Paul himself doth thus explain it, *Ephes. 6. 23.*—*Faith from God the Father, and the Lord Jesus Christ*: where he distinguishes the Son not simply from God, but from God the Father; this denies that the Son is the Father, but still implies that the Son is God. Now this Text being the more full and perfect, explains that in the *Corinthians*

Corinthians, by teaching us to supply these words [the Father] *The Grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, the love of God, viz. the Father, and the Communion of the Holy Ghost.*—Now this Text thus supplied and perfected by that, doth make a distinction of Persons, but not of Essences, that is, it teaches that the Son, and the Holy Ghost, are not the Father, but yet one God. This sense St. Paul expressed to the *Ephesians*, and therefore must intend it to these *Corinthians*.

Now the Text, thus explained, is not only a benediction to this Church, but also a Prayer to God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Ghost, that this Grace may descend upon it.

We never pray to God, but we pray to Father, Son and Holy Ghost, which was the judgment of Antiquity: For *Justin Martyr*, who flourished in the middle of the Age next after the Apostles, saith in his Apologie, we Christians worship Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, and yet against gentile Polytheism in the same Apology declares, that they worshiped God only; therefore they must necessarily understand it, that all three Persons together are that one God, whom they worshiped, and to whom

whom they prayed, which is one part of Worship.

But you will say, what is the reason then, we are not commanded to pray expressly and particularly to the Holy Ghost, as we are to God?

Ans. 1. In divers Scriptures [God] is put essentially for Father, Son, and Holy Ghost; therefore in those Scriptures all Commands, and Examples of praying to God, are to be understood inclusively of all three Persons, who are essentially one, and the same God.

2. The Father is the first Person in the Trinity, of and from whom the Son and the Holy Ghost are; therefore as for this reason the Son refers things principally to the Father, but not exclusive of himself; so for the same reason Prayers are directed principally to the Father, but yet are to be understood inclusive of the Son, and Holy Ghost, but not exclusive of them.

3. The Father is principal Agent in the Government of the World; and the first mover in all Divine Operations, saying to the Son, and the Holy Ghost, let us make Man: whence the Son saith, John 5. 17. *my Father worketh hitherto, and I work;* by which

which he speaks the Father principle Operator, but himself a Co-operator with him.

Again, the Son from the Father hath the Government of the Church, whence it is called the Kingdom of Christ, to which the Father Exalted him, and from the Father and the Son, the Holy Ghost is in the Ministration of it. Upon which Account, Prayers are directed primarily, and expressly to the Father, but yet are intended as extensive to the Son and Holy Ghost. They are directed most particularly to him from his Priority of Order and Operation; but yet they belong to all three in regard of the sameness of their Nature.

These things are suited to the Rules and Methods of the Divine Oeconomy, and may seem difficulties; but had our Considerer considered well, he had never made them supports of an Heresie.

Confid. 4. p. 19. *If the Holy Spirit, and our Lord Christ are — God, no less than the Father, then God is a Trinity of Persons, or three Persons; but this is contrary to the whole Scripture, which speaks of God as but one Person; and speaks of him, and to him by singular Pronouns, such as I, Thou, we, Him, &c.*

Ans.

Ans. We deny that any one Text of Scripture, doth prove that God is but One Person. He quotes, Job 13. 7, 8. *Will ye speak wickedly for God? — Will ye accept his Person? —* Whence he thinks, there can be but one Person, viz. the Father in the God-head. To which we Answer thus.

1. The letter of these Texts doth not say, that God is but One Person: Or that there is but one Person in the Godhead, which is the thing to be proved.

2. The Reason and Design of 'em, cannot possibly import any such thing. For these expressions are used to signify only the doing unjustly for God, as Men do for others, when said to accept their Persons. For Job hereby accuses his Friends of Injustice and Partiality, in that they justified God's Visitations upon, by Condemning him of Hypocrisie. Therefore these Texts are not suited to the Nature of God, nor designed to Determine, whether there be only one, or more Persons in the God head, but to signify unjust Censures; and therefore must import not a Singularity or Plurality of Persons, but only Partiality in their Judgment, between God and himself.

Will

Will ye speak wickedly for God? and talk deceitfully for him? Will ye accept his Person?

3. Phrases that are taken from the common usages of Men, or as common forms of Speech, are not to be used in an Argument, in which the Holy Pen-man did not intend them to the Contradiction of those Texts, which professedly speak of that point, this all Men of Reason and Judgment, must grant me; because in expounding Scripture, we are to consider not only Words, but Phrases, together with the Scope and design of the place, and if so, it must be granted in this Case before us, that these Texts in *Job*, which concern not the Nature of God, ought not to be brought to prove, there is but one person in the God-head, when so many Texts on set purpose, declare the Divine Nature of three.

He quotes also, *Heb. 1. 1. 2. 3.* God — hath spoken to us by his Son, who being — the express Image of his Person.

Ans. 1. God here must signifie the Father, because he speaks to us by his Son, whence the Son is the Image of his Father's Person. But however this doth not reach

with his Cause; for it proves indeed, that God the Father is but one Person, which we all grant: But it doth not prove there is no other Person in the God-head, which is the thing in controversy. Nay,

1. This Text is not only, not for, but is really against him. For if the Son be the express Image of his Father, he must duly Represent the Father, as Images duly Represent those things, whose Images they are: And if he, the Living Image of his Father, duly Represent the Father, he must have in himself all the Perfections of his Father, and consequently must be infinite himself, else he could not in his own Person or Nature, Represent infinite Perfections; and that he doth so is evident, not only from his being Termed the Image of his Father, but also from those words of his uncontroverted already, *Joh. 14.8. he that hath seen me, hath seen the Father.* So far is this Text from proving, but one Person in the God-head, that it consequentially introduces a second.

He cites, *Deut. 6. 4. 5. — the Lord our God is One:* the word is *Jehovah*, whence the Letter saith, *Jehovah is one*, and that the Jews Morning and Evening Repeated this

this Verse, to keep it in perpetual Memory, that Jehovah or God, is not only, nor two or three.

Ans. The meaning is, there is but One God, which is spoke in opposition to Gentile Gods, which the Jews were so much inclined to, not that there is but One Person in the God-head, which was never disputed among them. We say then, that *Jehovah* or God, is but One, viz. Nature or Substance, that is, there is but one God, which is all this Text can pretend to, and all that our *Sacrian* can prove: But we say likewise, that *Jehovah* or God, is three Persons, viz. Father, Son and Holy Ghost. That the Father is *Jehovah* or God, the *Sacrian* grants, and that the Son and Holy Ghost are *Jehovah*, or God, we will prove.

1. That the Son is *Jehovah*, or God will appear from hence. In *Exod* 33.1, 2, 3. the Lord, the word is *Jehovah*, said, I will send my Angel, but I will not go up into the midst of thee. Now as the Letter supposes, that *Jehovah* is God, so in this very place, it can signify no other than God properly. Because,

1. *Jehovah* is here Distinguished from an Angel, as such, and therefore from every Angel, I will send my Angel, but I will not go. — and

2. He

2. He declares his propriety in this Angel, for it is [my] Angel: An Angel that is *mine*, that is, my Creature, and my Servant: Which words I found upon this bottom, that we never find in all the Scripture, that one Angel speaks thus of another; for though there be different orders of Angels, yet they are all Servants of God, not the Servants one of another. Therefore this must speak this *Jehovah* to have that Right to Propriety in, and that Power over this Angel, which God has to, in, and over his Creatures.

Then Gen. 18. 1. *The Lord* i. e. *Jehovah*, appeared to Abraham, v. 2. expresses it by *three Men*; but v. 3. calls only one of these three *Jehovah*, or *Lord*, the same is so called again, v. 13. 20. and v. 22. doth again expressly call these two [*Men*] but this [*Jehovah*] This only was Dignified with these Titles, to this only did *Abraham* bow himself, and direct his Discourse. Now since this *Jehovah* is so industriously distinguished from these Men, as he was before from that Angel; and v. 25. is called *the Judge of the World*; which neither is true, nor was ever affirmed,

of any created Spirit, it must needs be
that this Jehovah is God. But now this
Jehovah cannot be the Father, because
ms. This Jehovah appeared in humane
shape; as, to *Joshua*, to *Moses*, so to
Abraham, whence himself, and the two
with him, are called Men, &c. but the
Father never appeared in humane shape;
and the Teaching that he did was anti-
ently, as well as justly, condemned as
part of the Patropassion Heresy; and
ms. These three are called Angels *Heb.*
13:21 because they were sent, as the
Word imports; but the Father being the
first Person in the Trinity, cannot be sent
from any. *1 Cor. 13:14* The Result then is, here is Jehovah i. e.
God appearing in the likeness of Man,
but the Father never did appear in this
likeness; therefore this could not be Jeho-
vah, or God the Father; but must be Je-
hovah, or God the Son, whom the Fa-
ther sent in humane shape as an intimati-
on of his future Incarnation. This is evi-
dent from *Joshua*; for *vs. 11* he sees
a Man with a drawn Sword, and *vs. 13*
Who he was for the Man answered,
G v. 14,

v. 14, *As Captain of the Host of the Lord*
am I come. Here this Man is Captain of
 the Host of *Jehovah* the Lord; and yet
 e. 6. v. 2. this Man, this Captain, is him-
 self *Jehovah* the Lord; for after he had
 answered *Jesus*, and commanded him to
 put off his shoes, because the Place was
 holy e. 7. v. 15, then e. 8. v. 2. *Jehovah*
the Lord, i. e. this Man, this Captain, said
 to *Jesus* — Therefore the former *Je-*
hovah, or Lord, is the Father, whose Host
 this was, and the latter *Jehovah*, or Lord,
 is the Son, who was sent from the Father
 as Captain of it.

This was the Sense of all Antiquity,
 for so *Justin Martyr Dial.* so *Grammaticus* e.
 e. 1. v. 1. and e. 3. and so *Tertullian de Inter.* c. 6.
 and e. 4. *Adversus* l. 3. c. 9. who were fol-
 lowed by *Cyprian*, *Origen*, and the rest.

Again Gen. 19. 24. the Lord [*Jehovah*]
 rained down Fire from the Lord [*Jeho-*
vah] in Heaven. The Sense of this Hi-
 story shews that the former *Jehovah* is the
 very same with *Jehovah* e. 18; whence,
 the latter must be the Father, who was
 in Heaven. This was the Judgment not
 only of the first cited Fathers, but also of
 the

the first Council of *Sirmium*. And indeed as this Appearance in humane shape was a Signification of his future Incarnation, so his casting down Fire from Heaven was a Type of the last Conflagration, when this *Jehovah* the Son shall come from *Jehovah* the Father to judge the Quick and the Dead: for which reason *Abraham* calls him the Judge of the World, *Gen. 18. 25.*

We shall confirm and conclude our Point in our Answer to *Crollius*, who, as *Nomine Jehovah*, objects several things against us with a design to perswade that [*Jehovah*] is not a Name proper to God, but is sometimes given to Angels properly taken; and consequently, that this *Jehovah* was not the Son, but only an Angel of God.

Object. 1. These three in *Genesis 18.* are called Angels *Ex. 13.*

Ans. They are likewise called Men *Gen. 18. 2.* Whence let the *Socinians* tell me,

1. Why one of these Angels may not be the Son of God, as well as these three Men be Angels? And what, and *John 1. 1.*

2. Why the other two should be called only Men and Angels; but this be styled

Jehovah, whom the Scriptures distinguish from Men and Angels, unless to denote the distinction of his Nature from all created Beings: and why he should then be joined with the Father under the same Name Jehovah Gen. 1. 9. unless to declare the sameness of his Nature with the Creator, God blessed for ever.

Object, 2. He, who is called Lord [Jehovah] in Exod. 3. 7. is expressly said to be an Angel of the Lord, v. 2. Whence he thinks that Jehovah is a Name not proper to God; but common to Created Spirits.

Ans. Angel doth note his Office, at being sent from the Father; and Jehovah notes his Nature, as being of the same Substance with the Father: for v. 6. this Jehovah saith, I am the God of Abraham; and v. 14. he styles himself, I am; this implies a perpetual Existence from everlasting to everlasting, which is not comparable to any Creature. Hence our Saviour saith Matt. 23. 31, 32. Have ye not read, what God spake to you by his Angel, but that which he spake to you by God, saying, I am the God of Abraham. Where our Saviour himself, who is the best

best Interpreter of Scripture, teaches that this Jehovah was not a created Spirit, but even God himself. Upon which *Justin Martyr Apol.* saith, this is *Christus* our Christ. And *Tertul. adv. Prax.* c. 34. *Deum i. e. Filium Dei Visum—Moyse—God,* that is, the Son of God was seen by *Moses*: the same you have again *1. 16.* See *Cyprian adv. Juda.* l. 2. *et 30 T. 4. B. 100*

Object 13. Jehovah is indeed a Name proper to God, but yet is sometimes given to Angels, as they personate God, i. e. bear his Name and Authority. *1. 10. 25 W*

Ans. Here was not only the Name and Authority of God, but also that Honor received which is due to God only: for *Moses* by special Command did worship him: but you have not one such Instance of an Angel that any way appeared to be a created Spirit, that bore the Name and Authority of God, and received the Honor due to God. The Angel to the Blessed Virgin spoke otherwise, and that to *S. John* forbade him to Worship him, and that for a reason common to all created Angels, *Revel. 19. 10. See thou do it not, for I am thy Fellow-Servant,* and thou must be like him.

mediocris

As we find no such thing, so neither can any such thing ever be; for God hath said, *My Glory will I not give to another*; but this gives a Creature his Name, his Authority, and his Honor; and these are his Glory. Therefore the matter of this Objection is not only not found in the Scripture, but is even contrary to it.

Object. 4. The Law was given by the disposition of Angels, Act. 7. 53. and was spoken by Angels, Heb. 2. 2. whence he presumes that Jehovah, who gave the Law, was not the Son of God, but a created Angel.

Ans. This doth not follow: for as it was given by Angels, so it was *Gal. 3. 19. in the hand of a Mediator, that is, of Christ; as Theophylact and others take it.* But some say this Mediator was *Moses*: be it so, it is all one. For if *Moses* was Mediator, it was only as a Type of Christ, and there must be an exact Agreement between the Type and the Anti-type; therefore if the Law was given by *Moses* a typical Mediator, it must be given by Christ the true and proper Mediator. Whence the Result must be, that *Moses* gave it immediately

mediately to the People, but Christ gave it immediately by *Moses*, and by those *Angels*, which are ministering Spirits. Therefore when *S. John* saith, *1. 17.* the Law was given by *Moses*, his *Grace and Truth*, i. e. the Gospel, came by *Jesus Christ*, he respects the immediate Delivery of both; the Law was given immediately by *Moses*, and the Gospel immediately by *Christ*: which excludes *Christ* from only an immediate, but not from a mediate Delivery of the Law.

But the Difficulty is from *Heb. 2. 2, 3.* If the Word spoken by Angels was selfish, and every Transgression and Disobedience received a just recompence of Reward; how shall we escape, if we neglect so great Salvation, which was first begun to be spoken by the Lord? Upon which *Crollius* saith, the Gospel, which is the great Salvation, is preferred before the Law, because the Law was given by Angels, but the Gospel by the Lord: and consequently *Jehovah*, who gave the Law, was not the Lord, but an Angel.

And to strengthen this Argument we may add, that the Law was given by Angels, which is evident from *Exod. 24. 12.* And

Ans. This Text, which saith the Law was spoken by Angels, doth no more exclude the Son, than *Joh. 1. 17.* which saith the Law was given by Moses, doth exclude those Angels: for indeed it was given by all three. Therefore the Opposition lies not between Jehovah and the Son, who are the same, and gave both Law and Gospel too, but

1. Between his different manner of giving each: for (as before) he gave the Law mediately by Angels; but he gave the Gospel immediately by himself, as the Eternal Word now made Flesh: Upon which account Sin against the Gospel is a greater Affront to his Person and Authority, than Sin against the Law. And

2. Between the Nature of each considered in themselves: this is a great Salvation in comparison of that. And because Sin doth always arise proportionate to the means it is committed against, therefore upon this Account also Sin against the Gospel is greater than Sin against the Law.

Whence this toping Argument of *Crel-*
lius, which (he saith) doth *penitus* ever-
tere

tere totally overthrow us, doth neither exclude Jehovah the Son from giving the Law, nor yet debase him to a created Spirit; and consequently doth not at all affect us.

In fine, we grant that *Jehovah* is sometimes called an Angel, as he is sent from the Father; but we deny that an Angel, which is any way declared to be a created Spirit, is ever called *Jehovah*. Let the Socinian prove this, and then we will dismiss this Argument: else he saith nothing to the purpose.

2. The Blessed Spirit is also called *Jehovah*: for *Exod. 17. 7.* they tempted the Lord, the Word is [*Jehovah*]. This is repeated *Psal. 95.* whence the Apostle *Heb. 3. 7, 8, 9.* thus, *the Holy Ghost saith—When your Fathers tempted [me].* Therefore (according to the Apostles Application of these Scriptures) the Holy Ghost is this *Jehovah*.

The Result is, Jehovah is indeed but one God; but yet is three Persons, viz. Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, who are in the Godhead, and therefore are this one God, which was the thing to be proved.

ved: Whence his next Scripture, which is
*Isa. 45: 5. I am the Lord, the Word is [Je-
 hovah] there is no God before me,* is easily
 answered: For here Jehovah excludes a
 Plurality of Gods, but not a Plurality of
 Persons in the Godhead.

He adds (in his great Wisdom and
 Judgment) *Adam. 4. 10. Thou shalt worship
 the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou
 serve.* Where because [the Lord thy God]
 is singular, and that Word [only] excludes
 all others, he thinks he hath found a proof
 that the Father only is God.

Ans. This proves indeed that there is
 but one God, which we all grant; but
 it doth not prove there is but one Person
 in the Godhead; or that the Son and the
 Holy Ghost are not God; which he un-
 derstates.

But because Suppositions grant nothing,
 we will suppose that this Text proves that
 the Father only is God; but then it must
 be granted upon this Supposition, that it
 doth also prove, that the Father only is
 to be worshipped & for him only shalt thou
 serve. But the Socinians deny that the
 Son is God, and yet worship him as well

as the Father. Whence it evidently follows, that either their Religion must be an Heresie, or themselves Idolaters; for if the Son be God, they are Hereticks in denying it: if he is not, they are Idolaters in worshipping him. And certainly these Men are put to an hard Shift for Scripture-Proofs, when all the Texts they cite, do either not affect us, or wound themselves.

He now proceeds to his singular Pronouns, thus; *No Instance can be given in any Language of three Persons; who ever spoke of themselves, or were spoken to, by singular Pronouns, as I, Thou, &c. Such speaking is contrary to Custom, Grammar, and Sense.*

Ans. To this, that of the Learned Dean of St. Pauls, Dr. Sherlock, is the most apposite, viz. *There is no other Example in Nature of three Persons, who are essentially one.* Whence this is an Impropriety in reference to the Creatures, which is none in reference to God. For he may speak of himself, or be spoken to, singularly, because he is but one God; and plurally, because he is three Persons, without any ungrammatical Solecism. And sometimes
 he

he doth speak plurally, as *Gen. 1. 26. Let us make Man*: whence we conclude a Plurality in the Godhead. But this cannot be a Plurality of Essences, or Natures, for then there would be a Plurality of Gods, which is contrary to Scripture, for this declares there is but one; but a Plurality of Subsistences, which we call Persons, united in the same Nature. This Plurality other Scriptures, particularly *Psal. 33. 6. do determine to three, viz. the Lord, the Word, and the Spirit, and 1 John 1. 7. the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost*: and this we call a Trinity, as the Church ever did from the Apostles time.

But to this he saith, *God doth here speak of himself after the manner of Princes*, p. 21. and therefore is but one Person, though he saith [Us].

Ans. 1. He could not speak this after the manner of Princes, for then there was no Prince, nor any Man in the World: nor can he prove any such Custom in the Mosaic Age. Therefore this is an expounding the first Writings in the World after the Custom of later Ages, which we cannot allow.

TH 2. In time, Princes spoke [of] but not
[to] themselves plurally, which yet God
doth do; if this Gloss be true. Therefore
this Exposition, which he pretends is af-
ter the manner of Princes, is indeed with-
out all Example.

3. God himself expounds this Text our
way, *Psal. 33. 6. By the word of the Lord
were the Heavens made, and all the Host of
them by the breath of his Mouth; that is by
the Lord, viz. the Father, by the Word
or Son, and by the Spirit.* Now St. John
c. 1. v. 3. teaches that by the Word, viz.
that Word which was God, that Word,
which *Gen. 1. 1. was made Flesh,* were all
things made. Which directs us to under-
stand that [Word] in this Psalm, not of
the Ordinary, but of the Eternal, or
Substantial Word, or Son of God: to
whom together with the Spirit, *John
Gen. 1. 2. removed upon the Waters,* ap-
pearing that indigested Matter for its seve-
ral forms, the Father said, *Let us make
Man over us.* This was the Sense of all Antiquity;
Justin Martyr. Dial. c. 1. 24. 1. 370 he spake
to the Son, and the Holy Ghost, *per quos
est*

Or in quietness of mind first, by, and in
them, he made all things. Tertul. de Re-
surre. c. 6. and also Prati vi. 7. Orig-
en. Cels. l. 6. and the Church in general, which
pretend to give us nothing but
what is Apostolical.

He proceeds to 2 Cor. 10. 2. Some, who
think of [us] never, which he saith St. Paul
spoke of himself only.

Ans. It is not probable that St. Paul spoke
of himself after the manner of Princes,
when it is evident he offered himself in
almost everything but sin and sufferings.

What a Prince speaks plainly, we
know he speaks of himself, because
he it becomes after the Apostles were ma-
ny, and under the same Confines, there-
fore when St. Paul speaks plurally [us] we
have no necessity of understanding it of
himself only, but have reason to believe
he spoke of himself and them together.

Suppose that St. Paul spoke plurally
of himself, as Princes have done for many
Ages, yet what Argument is there in ei-
ther of these to prove that the Father is to
be understood thus in Gen. 1. especially
when the Scripture so frequently ascribes
the

the Creation to the Son, and Holy Ghost, as well as to the Father? There is therefore nothing manly, or cogent in the Quotation. By this time (I think) his singular Pronouns have done him as little service as his Scriptures.

Confid. 5. and 22. *Had the Son or Holy Ghost been God, this would not have been omitted in the Apostles Creed, which (they say) p. 23. was purposely drawn up to represent all the necessary Articles of Religion:* but that the Divinity of each is omitted there he should fain persuade the World.

This very Argument had almost perverted two of my Acquaintance; the one a very ingenious Merchant in this City, I shall therefore (according to their desire) give the fuller Answer to it: and shall prove ^{ed} That this Creed under the Apostles name was never composed by the Apostles; and so yads had been said most as is. Though it doth not expressly assert the Divinity of the Son and of the Holy Ghost, yet it sufficiently reaches both. This Creed was never composed by the Apostles. Some with more Presumption than Judgment think *Imman* and *Tertullian* there.

Tornish against us. But if you consult
those famous Places, *Iren.* l. 1. c. 2. *Origen*
Tertul. de Virg. Valand. c. 1. *de Presc. Hære*
c. 1. and *adv. Prax.* c. 2. you will find
these Fathers differ so much from one another,
and each from himself, both as to
the Order and Points of Faith they deliver;
that they evidently seem to intend
not any settled Form, but the Substance
of Faith contained in the Scriptures,
whence themselves might draw the Articles
they deliver.

Irenæus saith indeed, that his *Rule of Truth*, i. e. the Articles there writ, came
from the Apostles, which some have
thought sufficient to prove it of Apostolical
Composition. But
1. It is coming from the Apostles is no
Argument for them; for that might be
from their Writings in the N. Test. as well
as from this Creed, had they composed it.
His calling it the *Rule of Truth* is a-
gainst them; for it was not customary;
so neither is it so proper to call a Creed
the *Rule of Truth*, as the Scriptures from
whence all Creeds are taken, and by
which they must be proved. And now
3. There

all; but there is not so much agreement between the Articles in *Sm.* and this Creed called the Apostles Creed between those Articles; and some of those Creeds, which are well known to be the different Creeds of different Churches. Therefore there is nothing in this Father, that can prove the Socinian Assertion; but something, that may incline to the contrary. *nom. C. 1. 911*

As for *Tertullian* the Case is more clear; for he saith *de Pres. Her. c. 13* that this Rule of Faith, meaning the Articles there mentioned, were taught by Christ; but Christ composed no Symbol; and *what Father is it* This Rule taught the Mission of the Holy Ghost; but this Creed teaches no such thing. Therefore from both be mistaken the Scriptures, not a Creed; or if any, yet however not this. *nom. C. 1. 911*

Arian in Epiphanius adv. Hereticos lib. 21 *Her. c. 16* would fain have justified his Heresy against the Divinity of the Son from the Creed of *Alexandria*; which differs so much from that under the Apostles name, that none can pretend they are the same. But should be grieved, he would much rather have appealed to this, had it been

been, or believed to be theirs; and also thought not to reach the Divinity of the Son and the Holy Ghost, because Called composed by the Apostles themselves would have been of much more Force and Authority than one composed by any particular Church whatever. Therefore his Appeal to that, but not to this, is to me a Demonstration that this Creed was then not known, or else not believed either to be theirs, or to import any such Doctrine.

It could not come from the Apostles, at least as we now have it, which ought to cry much to take down Men's Presumption of its Antiquity, and must doubly raise that of Hyley, and *Albani* in his *Index Apostolicus*, who will have it to be unshakable, and therefore to come from them in all Points as it now is. For, in words.

1. Though *Joan* is brought from the *Psalm* into the *Mt* of the *Apostles* and in each place is rendered *His*; and the *Joan* and *Petrus* both speak of Christ going where the *Soul* of the dead are; yet the first *Psalm* (He descended into Hell) is not in any of the ancient *Creeds*

need

H

There or

or Fathers; nor yet in the Articles mentioned by *Innocent* and *Tertullian*, from whom they pretend to take this Creed itself. The first time we find it is in the *Interpolated and Irish*; but this appeared not till the fourth Century; nor could it be worn till the *Arian* Heresie. For *ad Magnus. Epist. ad p. 217.* he saith, Christ is the Word of God, *inquit, non ens, non factus, non genitus, non substantia.* For though the Notion is agreeable both to Scripture and the most antient Fathers; yet the distinction in these very Words was not known till *Arian* Evils made it necessary for the securing the sense both of Scripture and Antiquity.

2. The Word [*Catholic*] which this Creed uses, was not in use among Ecclesiastical Writers in the first Ages. For *Isidorus. Epist. ad Episcopos* expresses the thing by a Circumlocution, *the Church of all men, on the ends of the Earth.* And *Jerome. de. g. de. the Church of all men.* *Isidorus. de. g. de. the Church of all men.* *Isidorus. de. g. de. the Church of all men.* We find the Word itself first in *Clement. Strom. 2.* but it is not in any of the *Eastern* Creeds, till that of *Jerusalem*. *S. Cyrillus.*

prim likewise hath the Word; but it is in none of the Latin Creeds; till the fourth Age.

The Epistles of *James*, *Peter*, *John*, and *Jude*, must therefore be intitled *Catholic*, not by the Penmen, but by some later hand. The first time I observe them cited under this Title, is by *Cyril of Jerusalem*; who *Catech.* 6. wrote seventy years after *Augustine*, who broacht his Heresie under *Praxas* the Emperors about the year 270.

How then to bring *Myxology* out of the Wood, who places the Apostles with every one in Article of this Creed in his mouth as a Frontispiece to his Book upon this Subject, attributing the Doctine in to Hell god *Belzebub*, and the [Catholic] Church to *S. James*, I know not. Or whether *S. James* should have had Story of the Apostles bringing everyone this Article to the composing it; when the four Ages before him knew nothing of the matter, or why any should quote that Tract under his name as his own, which all learned Men (unless *Thomas à Kempis*) do now reject as spurious, I can as little imagine.

To

To conclude this Argument, Had the Apostles composed this Creed, it would have been found first in the Hebrew or Greek Tongues, in which they wrote: it would have been part of the Sacred Scriptures, or at least have been mentioned in the History of the Acts, and have been known to all the Churches founded by the Apostles, it being pretended to be wrote before their Dispersion from *Jerusalem*. But on the contrary we find it not till the fourth Century, and then known only to the Latin Church, which did obtrude it on the World under the Name of the Apostles; witness *Prætorius*, *Erasmianus*, *Baronius*, the *Paris* Doctors in their Censures of *Erasmus*, and others, who take up the Cudgels from their old Pope *Leo* in the fifth Age, as he did from *Rufinus*, and *Rufinus* from the spurious *Clement* in his Epistle to *S. James*; which was even rejected by all considering Men, because it appeared not in the Apostolick Ages; and also mentions the death of *S. Peter*, who never lived this *James*, to whom it is directed, and to many other: however some have

H 3

From

From Rome the Reformed Churches received this Doctrine, and that Rubrick of ours which calls it the *Apostles Creed*, is taken out of the Roman Breviary; which our Reformers (not fore-seeing the advantages the Socinians make of it) thought of no such moment as to call for an Alteration. But when our Church composed the Articles of our Religion, she expresses her self thus, Article 8. that which is commonly called the *Apostles Creed*: which doth not only not affirm that it is theirs, but suggests that it is not.

De Pila, who is more judicious and impartial than his Predecessors, grants that it is the Apostles as to the Doctrine it contains, but denies it to be of their composition; for he saith they *n'ont point composé de formule de foy, comprise en un certain nombre de mots*, have not composed a Formula of Faith comprised in a certain number of Words: he adds, *Iræmus* and *Tertullian* did not intend *de formule de foy, mais la foy même*, a Creed, or form of Faith, but the Faith it self. This is the Judgment of *Vossius*, *Erasmus*, our *Parkins*, and others: however some Men, who make

make a great noise about Antiquity, are pleased to take up an Error from others, instead of understanding the Authors they quote.

Had it not been for these Socinian Impudences discovered in this Letter, and in the fifth to the Publisher, as well as in other of their Writings both at home and abroad; I had rested in that of *Colinus Instit.* l. 2. c. 16. Ser. 18. *Apostolicum nuncupos, de Auctoritate inanimata, minime sollicitus:* I call it the Apostles, but in the mean time trouble not my head about the Author.

But after all this, What ground hath this Letter for his Confidence? It saith, *Art. 23.* this Creed is recited by *S. Cyril, S. Cyprian*, and *Socrates* in his *Hist.* lib. 5. c. 26. Quotations, that are true Socinian; for they are false, but if true, are yet insufficient for their end. For did these Authors recite this Creed, yet how doth this prove the Apostolical Composition of it? But *Cyril of Jerusalem* explains a Creed peculiar to that Church, which differs nothing material from that of *Nice* and *Constantinople*, except the Consubstantiality

tiality. The English Reader may find it
 at the end of the Life of this Father writ-
 ten by Dr. Cave. S. Cyprian hath it not,
 unless he means a Piece bound up with
 him in the Oxford Edition, which is ascrib-
 ed by some to S. Jerom, by others to
 Rufinus. Which (if so) must betray ei-
 ther his Ignorance or Sophistry. Sozomen
 indeed hath a Creed in the place quoted,
 but he there tells us, it was composed by
 Arius and Eusebius; and begins thus, Πρω-
 τινος δε του Θεου, πιστης ομολογιας. Hic
 Rector Insuper xpm & qm dnm & mtrm &
 aiavm psonm & dnm abv, si i ta mtrm
 i fide. We believe in one God the Father Al-
 mighty, and in the Lord Jesus Christ his
 Son, who was made of him before all Ages,
 God the Word, by whom all things were
 made.

This, he saith, is the Apostles Creed,
 which he so earnestly contends for; where
 observe,

1. What trust we may repose in Soci-
 nian Quotations; for if he is so false
 where he makes a particular Reference,
 what must the Reader expect where he
 only names an Author? This Answer

will prove what I there assert against the whole Party of em; That throughout this Letter, there is not one Quotation in seven, but what is either false, or not to his Purpose. If they will have this an Argument of their Learning, they may; but I am sure it is no proof of their Honesty.

The Socinians deny that our Saviour did exist before his Incarnation: but this Creed saith, *That he was before all Ages, and made all things.* I demand therefore of our Socinians, that they profess this Faith, or acknowledge themselves the Perverters of Truth, and Debauchers of Antiquity. And indeed (like the Harpies) they rarely settle upon any place, but they so pollute it, that it wants a laborious Pen to cleanse, and restore it to it self. He hath then Presumption only, but no colour of Proof, that the Apostles composed this Creed. We therefore proceed to the next part of our Argument.

3. Though this Creed, called the Apostles, doth not expressly assert the Divinity of the Son and Holy Ghost, yet it sufficiently teaches both. For,

1. It dash still the Son his [only] Son; which Words indeed in themselves import only this, That he is a Son in such sort as none else is; which the Socinian would persuade respects not his Divinity; but his being born of a Virgin: but take them together with the Scriptures, whence they are themselves taken, and by which they must be explained; and then it will sufficiently appear that his only Son is a Son by Nature. Whence S. Austin in *Symb. l. 1. c. 2.* *Unigenitus, et deus Dei filius, agnoscitur Deus*, the only Son of God is God. This some other Parts of our Dispute will evince so far as the Letter hath led us to this Argument. But,

2. As to the Holy Ghost, he thinks nothing can be here pretended to prove him a Divine Person, excepting only the Phrase of believing with the Preposition [in] which is also before the Church, and therefore can ascribe a Divinity to the one no more than to the other.

But his Thoughts are very short, and dull. For though this hath been a common Error, which some at this day will hardly be drawn from; yet we declare that

that we neither do, nor need for the establishing this Doctrine, hold any such force in this Phrase. See Dr. Hammond's *Præfatus Catechismus*, lib. 5. Dr. Palsen, and Hylton upon this Article, who absolutely deny it; because not this Creed only, but all Antiquity apply it to Men, and so do the Sacred Scriptures. They instance in *Exod. 14. 31. The People believed [in] the Lord* and [in] *Moses*; and *1 Sam. 27. 30. Achish believed [in] David*. To which we add that of our Blessed Saviour *John. 9. 45. Moses, the Son of man, in whom ye believe, or trust,* as we translate it.

They, with *Masculus*, and others, impute the Notion to *S. Austin* and *Jerom*, whose Translation first omitted the Preposition in these Texts of the Old Testament, which other Translations follow.

A little before these Fathers *Greg. Naz.* acknowledges the Preposition in the Translations of his time, but yet saith this Phrase ought to be applied to none but the Lord; for the People did believe in *Moses* not as *Moses*, but as a Type of the Lord, and consequently this did not terminate in *Moses*, but did refer ultimately to the Lord.

But

But he did not consider that *Achish* believed in *David*; but he could not believe in *David* as a Type of the Lord, when he knew neither the Lord, nor that *David* was any Type at all. Hence *Achish* took his Notion of the Peoples believing in *Moses* as *subordinate* to the Lord; but there could be no such subordinate Faith in this Heathen Prince, who yet believed in *David*. This was therefore an Error growing and settling it self in the Church sometime before *Jerom* and *Austin*; but however it was these two that fixed the Point, and by that Omission in that Translation, as well as otherwise occasioned others to err with them.

But you will say then, where, or how doth this Creed teach the Divinity of the Holy Ghost? I answer that the Son, and the Holy Ghost are put into this Creed as equally Objects of Faith and Worship with the Father; and this is the very thing that declares the Divinity of both. Nor is this from Men, but from God; for it was so done upon the special Precept of our blessed Saviour in the form of Baptism, which is the Original of all Creeds.

in confess the Fathers use this Phrase in
 their Disputes for a Trinity. So Greg. Nyss.
 1. 2. *contra Eunom.* l. 1. if the Holy Ghost
 be not God, *Ti. mecum es, & aequum m.*
zno. Why do Men believe the H. Ghost?
 But observe, he doth not here Dispute
 from the sole force of that Phrase of *belie-*
ving in, but from our believing in the
 Holy Ghost as well as in the Father, which
 makes the Blessed Spirit equally with the
 Father a sharer in our Faith, and Adora-
 tion. In this sense is *Hila. Ric. Epist. de*
Trin. l. 9. who teaches that we cannot
 believe in the Father without the Son;
 whence he concludes they must be the
 same in Nature: But this Conclusion is
 drawn not from the Form of the Expres-
 sion, that *we believe in*, but from the Mat-
 ter expressed, that they are both equally
 the Object of our Faith. *rationem no deb*
 And indeed there is no such Extrava-
 gance in this World as to teach that men
 believe in God, in a Creature, and in simple
 Power; that he who will not give his
 Glory to another, should see a more Great
 deity, and a naked Power, not in person,
 which is no Person, equal with himself in
 the Faith and Adoration of his People.

Answer.

So

So fallily doth this Letter pretend from this Creed, that the Apostles did believe as the Socinians believe; when neither did the Apostles compose it, nor is it any way servicable to the Socinian Hypothesis.

SECTION V.

Now, as if he had proved his Point, when he had proved nothing, but what we may safely grant him, he concludes p. 24. parag. 6. *Theirs, viz. the Socinians, is an Accountable and a Reasonable Faith.*

Ans. A Faith just as Reasonable as this Inference: For as this is drawn from no due Premises, so that stands founded on neither Scripture, nor good Argument. A reasonable Faith indeed, which makes a Finite God, and an Infinite Creature: Which denies the Son to be God, and yet doth Worship him! A reasonable Faith, which cannot support itself without expunging some Texts out of the Sacred Canon, without transposing the parts of others contrary to the Ancient and most Authen-

**A barefaced Reading, and without expounding
some contrary to the very Letter,
and most evident Design of the piece!**

Section himself was so sensible of the reasonableness of this Faith, that he not only rejects the sense of the Church, but in his Epistle to Helvetius he allows the offering any force to the Sacred Scriptures, rather than to their own Sentiments; in which our present Sentiments are his strict Disciples. And do Jesu Chris. Salvat. per. 2. c. 6. 14. 2. he vents himself thus, if I find such things, *non solum, sed sepe* not once, but often in the Scriptures, *non in circumsione, sed in multis* *scilicet in multis* : I will not for all that believe it. And if this be an accountable and a reasonable Faith, which is founded not on the Scriptures, but on the Wills of Men, then all Heresies must be accountable, and reasonable too. But on the contrary, this Faith is a most unaccountable, and a most unreasonable, nay a blasphemous, and most dangerous Faith, which makes the Writings of Men, was *Martin*, did his *Alcoran*, the Peoples Bible; and their Rule of Faith.

But that of the *Trinitarians* (the faith) is absurd,

absurd, and contrary to Reason; and is
self. And therefore is not only false, but im-
possible. His Reason is, that we teach there
are Three Persons, and most Wise Persons,
and yet but one God.

Answer. The Scriptures cannot teach any
thing absurd or impossible, but the Scrip-
tures do teach there are three, who are but
one God; therefore this Doctrine of ours
is not absurd and impossible. Now that
there are three, who are but one God, is
evident as from other Places; so likewise
from 1 John 5. 7, 8. The Father, and the Son, and
the Holy Ghost; and these three are one, and
there be three that bear witness in Earth; the
Spirit, the Water, and the Blood; and these
three agree in one. Which Texts I will be-
clear from all their Cavils, that they shall
sufficiently vindicate our Doctrine from
being absurd and impossible.

Enchiridion, and the rest, would expunge
the last Clause in the 7th Verse, thus there
are one. Because

1. Some Fathers, who wrote previous-
ly on the Trinity, have ascribed to them
he makes them to be added by some other
my of the Trinity.

builds

Answer.

Ans. 1. *St. Cyprian* in the middle of the Age before *Arius*, hath this Text intire *de Unit. Eccles.* and *St. Jerom* soon after *Arius* censures the Omission of this Clause. Now that of *Enicodius* is impossible, for these Words could not be added by some Enemy of the *Arians*, in the time of *St. Cyprian*, who flourished almost an Age before *Arius* himself was. But the careless, or designed Omission of 'em is necessarily true, because the 4th Age wanted them, after *St. Cyprian* in the 3d Age had 'em. Nor do we find many that quarrell'd with *St. Jerom* for censuring this Omission, which some would certainly have done, had he not had a ground for this Censure, which is an Argument that *St. Cyprian* himself had this Clause, and that it was not afterwards toyld in by some other hand.

2. They plead, that *P. 7.* is not in the *Syriac*, nor *Arabick*, whence some reject the whole.

Ans. We grant it; but *P. 8.* is in both; which is linked to *P. 7.* by a *Conjunction Copulative* [and], beside which, the *Sense*, *Coherence* and *Dependence* of these

these with, and upon one another, I speak this imperfect without that. Whence *Baza* (whom *Letter 4*, p. 152 quotes on his side) saith both must be expunged, or retained together, and then concludes for the retaining both. And indeed this Case is so clear, that since the *Socinians* receive *V. 8*, they must receive *V. 7*, too, or renounce their own reason.

We proceed to confirm the whole Verse to be authentick.

1. These words [*I and my Father are one*] are allowed on all hands to be *St. John's*; therefore those Words [*these Three are One*] from the Likeness both of Style and Matter, seem to be his too. For such a Likeness between Text and Text, is as good an Argument (according to the proportion of Matter) to prove that each have the same Author, as it is between that Gospel and his Epistle; But all Learned Men allow of this Argument, therefore the *Socinian* must allow of that, or differ from the World of the Learned, as they do already from the World of Christians.

2. Our Learned Bishop of *Salisbury*, Dr. *Burnet*, in his Letter from *Zaria*, observes that

that among Ten Copies he had seen a-
broad, Nine had either the *7th V.* or *St.*
Jerome's Epistle, or Preface, which con-
demns the Omission, while One only
wanted both. Therefore among Ten Co-
pies one only was purely *Arian*, or *Soci-*
nian; because the Omissions in them
that wanted, are condemned not only by
that Epistle, or preface, but by them al-
to who added that Epistle or Preface to
those Copies.

3. Suppositions grant nothing; there-
fore suppose we, that this Text it self is
not authentick, yet the Matter of it is
taught by all those Scriptures, which as-
sert the Divinity of the Father, the Word
and the Holy Ghost, and the Existence
of but one God; for they, taken toge-
ther do assert that *these Three are One*;
that is, *One God*, or *One in Nature*; there-
fore was the *Socinian* a Man of that Rea-
son he pretends, he could not think the
expunging this Text out of the Sacred
Canon, of so much moment, when di-
vers others taken together speak the same
thing. He is then employed about a
Work he can never effect, or if effected,
yet can do him but little, if any service.

For which reasons they betake themselves to other Methods.

For they farther plead, *If this Text be Authentick yet it cannot intend one in Nature, but One in Testimony, because each verse speaks of each three as Witnesses.*

Ans. True, each intend Testimony, as *Beza, Calvin, Erasmus* and others observe. But this doth not prove that *v. 7.* intends no more; nor do these Authors Exclude an Unity of Nature. But the variation of the Phrase implies a restriction of the matter. For *v. 7.* saith, *the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost, are One*; which is equally extendible to Nature, and Testimony. But *v. 8.* saith, *the Spirit, the Water, and the Blood, agree in One*: Which is applicable not to Nature, but to Testimony, especially where Testimony is mentioned, or evidently intended; therefore we understand the former of One in Nature, and Testimony both: else we do not take the Phrase in its full latitude, nor make it comport with those other Texts, which declare the Divine Nature of Father, Son, and Holy Ghost: And yet that these three are but

but One True, and Almighty God: because that Nature is numerically one, in which they all agree: But we understand the latter of Testimony only, because the phrase designs no more, nor do any other Scriptures declare that the Spirit, the Water, and the Blood do agree in Nature, as the other do.

But they insist thus, *The Expounding, v. 7. of Nature, doth lose the design of these Texts, which speak of Testimony.*

Ans. The Expounding it of Nature only, exclusive of Testimony, would have gave some colour of Reason to his Objection: But we Expound it both of Nature, and Testimony too; which Exposition doth not lose, but secure the design of this Text. For since they are One in Nature, and that Nature is Divine, they must be One in Testimony, and that Testimony must be infallible too; because three Divine Persons, who are one in Nature, can neither agree in a false Testimony, nor disagree in that Testimony they give.

Can we now think that this Doctrine, which teaches *there are Three, who are but one God*, is false, and impossible;

we differ. Therefore since we so far agree, they ought to set forth how we hold *Three to be but One*, together with our Reasons for this Doctrine; which would lead even a prejudiced Reader to some deliberation: and not by a partial and Sophistical Representation, make our Doctrine seem *prima facie*, absurd and impossible, to the end they may huff off all consideration of it.

Indeed their manner of Union is common among Men; but if ours is plainly founded on *Divine Revelation*, as we maintain it is, the *singularity of the thing* is not able to destroy the *Thing it self*; and therefore ought in Justice to be so proposed, as to leave Men to examine and consider it; and not to be rejected without either.

2. They say, *Let. p. 159* We teach there are *Three Persons, who are severally, and each of them the true, and most high God*; and yet there is but *One true, and most high God*.

Ans. We teach, there are *Three Divine Persons, who together are the true and most high God*. They are every one a Divine Person, or God, as they have every

every one a Divine Nature; but they are together the true and most high God; as that Divine Nature is but *One*, tho common to all *Three*. The Distinction arises from the distinct manner of Subsistence; but the Unity from the *Sameness of Essence*. This speak *Three that are God*, but not *Three Gods*, because these are all within the Godhead, as having but one and the same Substance; and consequently can be but *One God*.

3. Their Objections arise from the want of Parallel Instances in Nature; whence they speak it absurd, and impossible; but the Absurdity lies on their side, who measure *Supernatural things* by *Natural*, and will believe nothing of God but what they see in the Creature; as if an *Infinite Nature* must be in all things commensurable to the Nature and Thoughts of what is *Finite*.

4. They declare it absurd and impossible; because we cannot demonstrate the manner of it, how *Three can be but One*; when the thing being matter of pure Revelation we had known nothing of it, unless it had been Revealed; and therefore now can know no more, than is

revealed. Now it is revealed that the Father is God, the Son is God, and the Holy Ghost is God, and yet these are not Three Gods, but One God. But how this is, Revelation doth not tell us. Therefore we are not absurd, who teach what the Scriptures teach; but they are absurd in demanding more.

The Church indeed uses the distinction of *Personal* and *Essential*; that they are *Three Personally*, and but *One Essentially*; that is, they are *Three Persons*, and but *One God*. Not that these Terms are fully, and so clearly expressive of this Mystery, as to remove all Cavils and Difficulties; but that she may (the best she can) express her own Sense, the Sense of Antiquity, and the import of those Scriptures that respect a Trinity. Let them give us more proper, and significant Terms, and we will use them; but let them not reject a Divine Truth for the sake of those Terms which Heresie hath forced us to make use of.

5. This method of theirs implies a whole train of Absurdities, for we are to prove, First, [That] a thing is; and then [how] it is: If we prove the

the former, that must be granted, because proved ; though we should never be able to prove the latter. But they (contrary to all the Rules of Art, and method) require us to prove [how] it is, in order to their believing [that] it is : And do reject that part, which is proved, only because the other is not. According to this method they must deny a thousand things, which they see, which all Mankind will say is absurd with a witness.

They say p. 158, that *Interpretation of Scripture can never be true, that holds forth either a Doctrine, or a Consequence, that is absurd, contradictory, or Impossible.*

Ans. We readily grant it, and such is that of the Anthropomorphites mentioned in the next Page. For God is a Spirit, but not a Body. Because body is compounded of parts, is subject to Dissolution, and cannot be in all places at once, therefore those Scriptures, which ascribe humane parts to God, cannot be true in a literal sense ; but only in an improper one.

And

And when these Men have proved such an absurdity, contradiction, or impossibility in the Doctrine of a Trinity, we will dispute no more.

They may indeed prove that three Men cannot be one, or one Man three, but as the Learned Bishop of Worcester, Dr. Stillingfleet, observes, they can never prove that an infinite Nature cannot communicate it self to three different Subsistences, without such a division as is among created Beings: Because a Finite capacity can never comprehend the Powers, and Operations of an infinite Nature. So absurd are these Men as to decry revealed Truths for absurd, and impossible, only because they cannot understand them. Should they do the like in natural things, they would quickly become the contempt of Mankind.

We are not ashamed to own a Mystery in the Divine Nature, when we find little but Mystery in common Nature her self. Nor can we think it unreasonable that God should command us to believe that a thing is; though he hath not told us how it is;
any

any more than it is unreasonable that Nature should oblige us to assent, where she most refined Reason can find no place of Entrance. God hath revealed so much as is fit for us to know; and ignorance is neither a Sin, nor a Reproach, where he hath not instructed us.

But we must declare it not absurd only, but blasphemous too, to deny what God hath told us, only because he hath not told us more; or not satisfied our Cavils by a demonstration; as if, they dare not believe him any farther than they can see. A right Nicodemus temper, which stumbles at Divine Truths only with an — *How can these things be?*

SECT. 6.

From their Reasonable Faith, he proceeds to complement its professors for Learned, and Reasonable Men: Which (the Faith) *is* their Character among their worst Adversaries.

Ans.

Ans. We do not envy what Learning, and Reason they are thought to have: But we charge them with the abuse of both. Their Guilt this way will easily appear to any, that can but understand an Author; their Arguments being fallacious, and their Quotations false. But as for this Epistler (poor Man) though we cannot admire his Talents, yet we must declare he misimproys that little he hath. This will abundantly appear as from what he hath done, so likewise from his History of the Socinians, which we now proceed to.

For p. 26. thus, those, whom we call Socinians, were by the Fathers, and first Ages of Christianity, called Nazarens, by which name St. Paul is accused before Felix, Acts 29. 5.

Ans. A Christian signifies a Disciple of Christ; and Nazaren in this place a Disciple of Jesus of Nazareth. And did then denote not a Party, but the whole Body of Christians. So Epiphanius ad. Har. l. 1. to 2. Her. 29. Nazareni, &c. &c. &c. all Christians were then called Nazarens; and that

that by way of contempt from the
Jews, as they afterwards were *Galileans*
 by the Apostate.

They are indeed branded for a Sect
 in the place quoted, but not as a par-
 ty broke off from the body of Christi-
 ans, but as the Church of Christ now
 separated from the *Jews*. I beseech
 you then what peculiar honour, and
 advantage can the *Securians* claim to
 themselves from hence, was the thing
 they plead true, when, as Christians,
 they have this honour, but in com-
 mon with others; and, as *Spirituans*,
 can pretend to but one of the smallest
 shares of it.

The same Father, c. 7. tells us of a Sect
 of *Nazarenes*, even before the Incarnati-
 on, tho' indeed *Petrus* rejects the Ac-
 count; nor can I see any sufficient
 grounds for it; but however I mention
 it to pleasure our *Securians*, who are seek-
 ing a Pedigree. Therefore take it thus,
 some of these (he saith) professed Christ,
 but denied his Divinity; in other things
 they were *Jews* still; for they observed
 Circumcision, the Sabbath, and other
 Ceremonies; and therefore stood distinct

bo

both from Jews and Christians. Whence Jerom. Epist. ad Aug. gives this Character of 'em; viz. they are called *Mineans*, or *Nazarens*; *sed dum Volunt et Judai esse, et Christiani; nec Judai sunt, nec Christiani*; While they would pass both for Jews and Christians, they are neither. And if these Men will claim from hence, you have in them this Character of a *Sacrian*; That he is one who is neither Jew nor Christian. Hence I suppose this Epistler is none of the Reasonable, or Learned among them, since he hath mentioned this either to no purpose, or to his own disadvantage.

He there saith, they were also called *Ebionites*.

Ans. These were of two sorts, *Euseb. Hist. l. 3. c. 27.* the one held, that Christ was born of Joseph and Mary; the other of the Holy Ghost, and the Virgin. But both observed Jewish Rites, and rejected *St. Paul's* Epistles, calling him an *Apostate*. They received no Gospel but *St. Matthew*, and that mutilated too; *Epiphon. Adv. Heret. l. 1. to 2. Her. 30.* which *Petavius* observes was depraved by them, and was the same with the Gospel to the He-

Hebrews, which was used by none but Hereticks. *Orig. cont. Cels. l. 5.* saith, they teach the Law, and reject the Epistles of *St. Paul*. And *Optat. Milen. l. 4.* they held it was not the *Son*, but the *Father* that suffered.

They were these Men who troubled the *Apostles*, and drew their Disciples back to *Mosaic Rules*, under *Menander*, *Cerinthus*, and others, whose Heresy was substantially the same for divers Ages. Whence *St. Paul* brands them for *False Brethren*, *Gal. 2. 4.* elsewhere for *corrupters of the Word*, and *such as lie in wait to deceive*. This was the Reason they rejected his Epistles, because he so constantly censures them. And *Ebion* himself was branded by all Antiquity for one of the *Gnostic Hereticks*, *Tertull. de Præf. Her. c. 33.*

Yet our *Socinian Author* makes himself, and Party, the same with these. No matter what poison men seek in, so they deny the Divinity of *Christ*. This one Blasphemy suffices all. By this Rule they are the same with *Simon Magus*, the Father of Hereticks; and with the *Devil*, the Father of Lies; for they both denied

ed the Divinity of the Son, the one in making himself a Saviour, the other in tempting him; excepting this, that the Devil afterwards confessed this Truth, which the Socinian still denies. An hopeful Brood indeed, that Glories in such *De-
baters*!

He proceeds, the Socinians were also called, *Artemonites, Theodinites, Symmachians, Paulinists, Samosatensians, Photinians, and Monarchians.*

Ans. Grant this, and it must be granted too, that as these Men were always condemned for Hereticks, so the Socinians were always condemned in them. And strange it is they should always be in the right, and yet be always condemned for it.

They were called *Artemonites, Photinians, &c.* to signify they were the Followers, not of Christ, but of *Artamon, Photinus, &c.* And did the Socinians seriously reflect upon their Blasphemies, and their palpable Corruptions both of the Letter and Sense of the Sacred Scriptures, as well as of all Antiquity; it nearly concerns them to consider how far this is applicable to themselves; that is, in plain Eng-

likewise, whether the Name [*Sacrament*] be not better suit them than that of [*Christian*].

The Monarchians boasted, that they held the World was governed by a Monarchy; that is, by One God, in opposition to the Orthodox, who (they say) introduced Three Gods, by the Doctrine of a Trinity. Whence I grant, that these, and our *Sacraments* are Men of the same Pride and Falshood.

In answer to whom the Orthodox always declared (as we do) that they held no other than a Monarchy, and that the Doctrine of a Trinity is no way contradictory to this. For when some in *Tertullian* adv. Prax. c. 3. cried, *Monarchiam tenemus*; We profess but One God; he proves, that the Orthodox, or (if he will) the Trinitarians, did hold but One God too: for Proof of which he argues, a 4. that he deduces the Son from the Substance of the Father, and the Holy Ghost from both; which doth no way destroy, but (as he there pleads) confirms a Monarchy; for being all Three but of One Substance, or Nature, they can be all Three but One God.

Upon

acted like Men. But their insisting upon these terms without disproving our Doctrine, speaks them as wretched as their Cause; the one Barren, the other Blind, since both are forced to call in exploded Cavils to support them.

Hence he proceeds to Glory in some Men of Name among them, as Theodotion and Symmachus, both of whom Translated the Old Testament into Greek; and by Eusebius are called Ebionites, or Nazarenes.

Ans. Eusebius speaks them Ebionites, but not a word there of a Nazarene; under which name he vainly strives to sweeten himself, and Parry; that they might seem to appear with some little face of honest Christianity.

We acknowledge their Translation of the Old Testament, but being branded for Ebionites, we must presume they denied great part of the New. As for Symmachus, he is expressly said to reject the Gospel of St. Matthew. Therefore since our Socinians so passionately desire to pass for Ebionites, that I may gratify 'em what I can; I grant 'em there is one good reason why it should

be

be so, and that is, as the *Ebionites* reject some parts of Scripture, and corrupt others; so do the *Socinians* too; and now at length scoff at the Divine Authority of the Whole. The matter is too plain to be denied; I have sometimes heard it my self, and know of persons that condemn of some under their charge, that are debauched in their Principles and Manners by such Doctrines. But whether these are the strict sort of *Socinians*, or *Socinians* at large, viz. *Atheists* and *Deists* that now heard among them, I think they ought to acquaint us.

But let old *Theodotion*, and *Symmachus* be what they will, what is the Glory of having these two on their side, when the whole Church was against them? It must be a miserable Crop, where such gleanings are their Vintage.

But they have a third, it seems, *Paulus of Samasatum*, p. 47. a Man both Learned and Eloquent.

Ans. He did indeed deny the Divinity of the Son, which is the only thing (it seems) that makes him great and good. For *Enchiridion* H. l. y. c. 27. and

the Synodical Letter, c. 30. say, He had neither Wealth, nor Learning, but made himself vastly rich by sacriledge, and Oppression. His Pride was unmeasurable, he walked the Streets with Guards — He abolished the Psalms Sung in Honour of our Saviour, and had others Sung in praise of himself. He encouraged, and protected the Wicked, gaining to his side the worst of men.

Prateolus (among other things saith, He was proud and simple. He taught that Christ was more for the Jewish than the Christian Religion; whence he taught Circumcision; Of a Beggar he became Rich by Sacriledge, Oppression and Knavery.

These are the Characters of an Heretic, which neither himself nor Friends could ever Answer, and whom the vilest object would blush to own, unless a Socinian, who would adorn themselves with this mans Glories; like the wild Savages, who decked up themselves with the guns of beasts.

His next man is Photinus of Smyrna, now being deposed by the Council, his City would

would not part from him, till the Emperor
sent an Army to Expel him.

Ans. 1. Præconus, Hæz. l. 14. 25. saith,
Photinus held that Christ was a mere
Man, *Ex utroque sexu natum*, born of
both Sexes; but this the Socinians deny,
for they hold he was Born of the Holy
Ghost, and of the Virgin; therefore
this letter is false in reckning Photinus
one of them.

2. But however an Heretick he was,
and therefore a Party with the Socini-
ans, and (it seems) so dear to his City,
that the Emperor was obliged to Ex-
pel him by an Army. Suppose it yet
had this man considered how often
Constantius imposed his Arian Creatures
by Force and sometimes Established
em by Blood; he must have expected
to lose more than he thought to have
gained by this Plea.

3. This is an Appeal from the Go-
vernment both Civil, and Ecclesiasti-
cal to the Mob, an Argument that his
Heresie had left him but few, if any
Friends of Sense and Judgment.

He proceeds to Eusebius, H. l. 5. c. 2. and Theodoret. *Her. Fab. c. 2. de Armen.* And pretends, they say, that these Nazarens constantly affirmed, that they derived their Doctrine from the Apostles, — And that it was the general Doctrine of the Church, till the Popes, Victor and Zepherine, set themselves to root it up.

Ans. Neither of these in the places quoted, mention a Nazaren. But the Heretic of Arlesmon, renewed by Paulus Samosatensis, who taught that Christ is no more than Man.

Eusebius saith indeed, there were some who affirmed that all the Antients, and the Apostles themselves, taught this Doctrine, and that it continued till Victor and Zepherine. But he calls this an impious Lye, and proceeds, Perhaps this might seem credible, did not the sacred Scriptures, and the Writings of certain Brethren, more Antient than Victor, contradict them; I mean Justin, Miltiades, Tatian, Clemens and many others, in all whose Books the Divinity of Christ is taught. For who knows not the Writings of Irenaeus, Melito, &c. in which Christ is set forth as both God and Man?

The Psalms and Canticles of the Brethren written in $\alpha\epsilon\chi\eta\varsigma$, from the beginning— ascribe a Divinity to him. Seeing then this was so long since the Doctrine of the Church, how can it be, that all men to the time of Victor could teach that Doctrine which these men hold? —

Theodoret, in the place cited, saith, that Artemon pretended the Apostles taught that Christ was a mere Man, $\pi\alpha\rho\epsilon\mu\eta\tau\epsilon\upsilon\sigma\alpha\varsigma\ \tau\omega\upsilon\ \delta\iota\omega\gamma\epsilon\alpha\varsigma\ \omega\varsigma\ \tau\eta\upsilon\ \delta\iota\alpha\tau\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\sigma\alpha\varsigma$. Perverting the sense of the Sacred Scriptures. This exactly agrees with that of Eusebius. Therefore this Letter wisely refers us to those very places of Antiquity, which declare that Doctrine to be Heresie, and condemn the Maintainers of it of Falshood and Impudence, which yet it self would support. He told us the Socinians are Learned and Reasonable Men, but I hope this is not one of his Proofs of it.

However, the Letter proceeds, Victor (say the Socinians) began to persecute the Apostolic Doctrine of One God, or (which is the same) that God is One in the Year 194. but with little success, till that which was

was afterwards the Doctrine of the Arians, grew into general credit; ——— for Justin Martyr, Origen, and other principal Fathers, teaching (as the Arians afterwards did) that the Father is before the Son, and the Holy Ghost, in Time, Dignity, and Power; yet that the Word, or Son, ——— was created sometime before the World, ——— and that the Holy Ghost was the Creature of the Son.

Ans. The Letter tells us, That the Socinians say this; and indeed it may pass for a Socinian Story; for it hath not one Word of Truth in it. For,

1. The Doctrine of One God, or that God is One; that is, One person, as they explain it, never was the Apostolic Doctrine, as Eusebius, now quoted by himself, doth declare, both from the Scriptures, and from the most ancient Fathers, as well as from the Hymns composed in honour of Christ, from the beginning of the Gospel.

2. The Doctrine of One God, or that God is One; that is, not One person exclusive of other persons, but One God exclusive of other Gods, was the Doctrine of the Apostles and Apostolic Men, appears

pears from the same place in *Enchiridion*, and from all the same Topicks already mentioned.

3. That *Keter* did persecute, and root out the Heresie he contends for, doth not appear from any Monuments of those times, nor is in any reason to be supposed, because that Heresie had not then obtained in that Church; and what he did was only (according to the common Rules, and Practice of the Church) to quash this Heresie in its beginning.

4. The Letter makes it, that that pretended Persecution did little succeed, till it was assisted by the Doctrine of *Justin Martyr*, and *Origen*, which supposes that their Doctrine began under that Persecution, which is impossible: for this Persecution (the Letter saith) began A.D. 194. but *Justin* suffered about 30 years before that time, and *Origen* did not appear till the middle of the Age after. And,

5. Neither these, nor any other Fathers, from the Apostles to *Origen*, did ever teach any such Doctrine, which might be easily proved by an induction of Particulars, so far as their Works are come down to our hands.

Justin Martyr saith indeed, *Apol.* p. 60. that beside the Father, we worship the Son, ἐν δεύτερῃ ἰερόν, in the second place; and the Holy Ghost, ἐν τρίτῃ ἰερόν, in the third. Now here is a Priority of Order or Place, but where is that of Time and Power? Not in this Father, I am sure, but in the Socinian Comment only. We charge him with Falshood; let him clear himself by a particular Reference.

What Justin here saith, ever was, and still is the Doctrine of the Church. So Nazian. *de Trin.* c. 31. *Pater quia pater* — the Father, as Father, is before the Son, and yet he declares, that the Son is co-eternal and co-essential with the Father; which speaks (as we said) a Priority of Order or Place, but not of Time, because the Father and Son are co-eternal.

This must necessarily be the Sense of our Justin; for in the same Apology, p. 64. he saith, οὐκ ἑστὶν ἄλλος θεὸς ἢ ὁ πατήρ. We worship God only. Whence any Man in his Wits must conclude, that they held, that Father, Son and Holy Ghost are God; Else how could they worship all Three, and yet worship none but God? And if they are God, they cannot be after the Father,

ther, in Time, or Power, but must be co-
eternal, and co-equal with him.

Had Justin taught, that the Son, and
Holy Ghost are after the Father in time,
and yet had worshipp'd them, he would
hereby have totally ruin'd the very Rea-
son, and Design of this, as well as of o-
ther Apologies; which were purposely
written to justify the Christians, who
suffered any thing rather than worship
the *Gentile* Gods, for this very Reason,
that they were not from Eternity, and
consequently were not Gods, but Crea-
tures. Our Socinian (it seems) thinks it
enough to Name an Author, tho he
can find nothing in him to his purpose,
having neither Authority, nor Argument
for what he saith.

Iren. l. 3, c. 26. Endeavours to prove
that the Son is God by Nature, and
after some time spent on this Argu-
ment, thus *diligenter, igitur significat*
Spiritus Sanctus, per ea quæ dicta sunt,
generationem ejus quæ ex Virgine, & sub-
stantiam quoniam deus. The blessed Spi-
rit diligently signifies by what things
are spoken, his Generation, which is
of the Virgin, and his substance as he

is God. By his Generation he intends his humane Nature, and by his Substance as God the Divine. This (he saith) is expressed, *Iſa. 7. 14.* by that Word [*Immanuel*] God with us, or God in our Nature. He proceeds, his humanity appears from his eating Butter, and Honey, and his Divinity from his choosing the good, and refusing the Evil, &c. 15. This last (he saith) is added, least by his eating Butter, and Honey, *mude ſolammodo cum hominem intelligeremus*, we should think he is merely Man: And again the Word [*Immanuel*] intimates that we cannot see God in his own Nature, but as he is manifested in ours. It is therefore impossible that *Irenaeus* should hold that the Son is God as to Title, or Office only, as the *adrians* afterwards did, which he so plainly teaches that he understood him to be God in the *Trinitarian* sense, and that is in Substance, or Nature.

This shows what sense we are to take him in, *l. v. c. 2.* where he lays down this as one Article in the Christian Faith, that Christ is Lord, and God:

which

which Faith (he saith) the Church
throughout the World received, *καὶ
τὴν ὁμοθυμῶν, καὶ τὴν ἐκείνῃ μακάριον*
From the Apostles, and Apostolic Men:
And e. g. this Faith the Church keeps
as if she had but one Soul, and but
one Heart; where observe

1. That [God] must here signify
God by Nature, or Substance, because
he so explained himself in the place
before quoted.

2. It is impossible that the Doctrine
against the Divinity of the Son could
be the Doctrine of the Church from
the Apostles to Victor; when the Doctr
of the Son was the Doctrine of the
whole Church from the Apostles to
Irenaeus; who was contemporary with
Victor, as appears from the Fragments
of his Epistle to this Victor himself in
Euseb. H. L. 5. c. 24.

Clement of Alexandria, who flourished
under Victor, and Zepherine both,
is as clear in this matter, as Pen can
write, for he not only saith ad
Gent. that Christ is *ὁὗς τε καὶ ὁ υἱος τοῦ
θεοῦ* both God and Man; and *Πατ. 1. 2. he is
θεὸς καὶ ἀνθρώπος ὁ υἱος τοῦ θεοῦ* which I can
render

render no better than in the Words of
 the Apostle, 1 Tim. 3. 16. God manifest
 in the Flesh, but he also ascribes those
 things to the Son, which all Men must
 grant us, can be true of none, but God:
 For Strom. l. 7. the Son is ἀμερίμωτος
 indivisible, removes not from place to place;
 but is in all places, but is contained in none.
 Again he is ὁρᾶς by all Mind, all Eye,
 beholding all things. This sufficiently
 proves Clemens no Arian, since he so
 manifestly declares the Divine nature
 of the Son.

Strom. l. 5. he Collects certain Noti-
 ons out of Plato; which (he saith) can
 signify nothing else, but τὸ ἀγίον τριᾶ-
 δον the Holy Trinity. For he puts
 the Father as the cause of all things,
 then descends to δευτερον νεκρὸν τὰ δευτερον,
 and to τριτον νεκρὸν τὰ τριτον a second,
 who is conversant about second things,
 and to a third, who is employed about
 third things; he seems to understand
 by the former the Son, who continues;
 and by the latter the Holy Ghost, who
 finishes things. This (he saith) Plato
 had from the Hebrews; which Argu-
 ment he abounds in, pleading that the

Gentiles had their choicest Notions from the Jews mediately, or immediately.

But whether this was the sense of Plato or not; is totally foreign from my Argument. It is enough to me that this Father is so far from being either Arian or Socinian, that he looked upon the Doctrine of a Trinity as to plain a Truth, that he thought an Heathen could spell it out of the Old-Testament.

Tertullian wrote under Zephyrine; if not under Victor too; and yet *adv. Prax.* c. 2. saith, the Divinity of the Son was taught from the beginning: and what he understands by his Divinity, himself explains c. 3. where he declares that the Son is of the same Substance with the Father.

These are most undeniable Proofs of the shameless Impudence of this Letter, which will have all the principle Fathers of those times to be Patrons of the Arian Heresy.

As for Origen, he not only lived in the Age after Victor, but also upon *Revel. i. 8. I am Alpha, and Omega, the first, and the last, — the Almighty;*

doth declare that in these words St. John asserts the Divinity of the Son.

These things so totally ruine this part of the Letter, which would have *Arianism* the swaying Religion of those times, that I should perswade my self they would never more offer these falsehoods to the World; did I not find, they have the Confidence to revive old rotten Heresies; and both to adorn, and support their own by them, who were the worst of Men, as well as the most erroneous of Christians.

However the Letter proceeds p. 28, 29 *this Doctrine being advanced by Justin, Origen, and others, became the more current Doctrine of the Church, till in the Council of Nice it was Condemned, and another more popular (and so more taking) than that (as attributing to the Son Eternity, and Equality with the Father) did generally obtain.*

Ans. As Justin, Origen, and others of Note in the Church (as the Letter speaks) never taught any such Doctrine; so the Council of Nice did Establish no other, but what had always been the Doctrine of the Church, ac-

cording to that of *Arhanasius de Synodo
Nicaen.* decret. *ἡ καὶ ὁμοθυμαδὸν ἐκτετακται*
ὁμολογούμενη ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ καθολικῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ
the Faith Established at Nice, is the
Faith of the Catholick Church. What
this Father saith, we may easily prove
both as to the Doctrine it self, and
also as to the terms, that express it.

1. The Doctrine Established at
Nice is this, that the Son is of the
same Substance, Essence, or nature
with the Father; and therefore is
properly God as the Father is; but
that this was always the Doctrine of
the Church, is sufficiently evident
from what we have already cited
from *Justin Martyr*, *Irenaeus*, *Clemens*
of *Alexandria*, and *Tertullian*. To
whom I shall add *Ignatius*, who was
contemporary with the Apostles.

That his Epistles are Genuine, is ac-
knowledged by their beloved *Sandwich*,
and is Proved by Doctor *Pearson* against
Doubts, even to the Shame of all future
doubts, and oppositions. These often
style the Son God; *Epist. ad Smyrn.* bea-
ging thus) *δοξάζω ὑμᾶς ἐν παντί καὶ πάντοτε*
τὸν Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν ὃν ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ. And

p. 7. *Fos. Edit.* he asserts the Divinity again. But I refer the Reader to one Place, which can never be evaded by any *Tricks* or *Sectarian* Artifice; and that in his *Epist. ad Ephes.* there is *ἐκ τῆς ὁμοῦς*
ἁγίας τοῦ καὶ θεοῦ πατρὸς, γένεσις καὶ
ἀγένητος ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς θεοῦ. θεὸς ἐκ αὐ-
τάτου ὡς αὐτὸν καὶ ἐν μαρίᾳ, καὶ ἐν
θεῷ, ὡς ὁ πατήρ, καὶ τὸ ἐκ παλαιοῦ. In
 which words the Author doth distinguish
 between the Humane and Divine Na-
 ture of Christ; for he is *Carnal* and
Spiritual; of *Mary* and of *God*; he is
begotten and *unbegotten*; i. e. *begotten* of
Mary, and *unbegotten* of *God*: For his *E-*
ternal Generation respects not his *Nature*,
 by which he is *God*, but his *Person*, by
 which he is the *Son* of *God*. Again,
 he is *passible*, and *impassible*; that is, *pos-*
sible, as *Man*; for not only his *Body* was
 pierced, and crucified; but *Mat. 26. 38.*
 his *Soul* was *exceeding* for-
 rowful; or *incircumscribed* round with *Sor-*
rows; whence proceeded his *Agonies*
 and *Bloody Sweat*; therefore he is *im-*
passible only as *God*. This (I think)
 considered together with the whole Quo-
 ration,

tion, demonstrates, that it is the De-
 sign of this Author to assert the Divine
 Nature of Christ, because nothing but
 that can be *Unbegotten*, and *Impossible*.

2nd. The Terms in which this Council
 doth assert the Divine Nature of the
 Son, are, that the Son is *in* *substantia* *con-*
substantially *not* of the same Sub-
 stance with the Father, but this was no
 invention of that Council. For *Iren.* d. 3.
 c. 26, but now quoted, saith. that his
 generation of the Virgin speaks him man;
 but his substance speaks him God: And
 if so, he must be God in substance; and
 if God in substance, he must be as the
 same substance with the Father, because
 there can be but one Divine Substance,
 Essence, or Nature; as there is but
 One God.

Tertullian is more large in this Point;
 for *adv. Prax.* c. 2. and 3. he expressly
 saith, that the Father, Son and Holy
 Ghost, are Three, — *non substantia*,
 not in Substance; that is, they are not
 substantially distinct; but they are *con-*
substantia, of one, and therefore of
 the same Substance. Now, I pray,
 what is the difference between the Fa-
 ther and the Son's being *Unbegotten*, &c.

One Substance; and between the Son's being (in the Phrase of Nice) *homoousios* to the Father consubstantial with the Father? Even none. For he that is consubstantial with another must be of the same substance with that other.

In the same place the same Father varies the Phrase; but keeps to the matter; saying, that he deduces the Son *de Substantia Patris*, from the Substance of the Father; which implies what is imported by the two other Phrases. And this (he saith) was taught *ab initio Evangelii*, from the beginning of the Gospel. Therefore the Nicene Council did determine no more in this particular, than what was taught by the Church, even from the beginning of the Church it self.

So plain is it, that the Nicene Fathers did neither invent any New Terms, nor imple any New Doctrine; but did only declare and confirm that which was the Doctrine of the Church from the Apostles themselves. This gives Credit to not only what we have quoted from Irenaeus already, but also to that Passage in his Epistle *ad Episc. in Africa*, that the Bishop of Rome and Alexandria, did from an hundred and thirty years since con-

demn

damn those who denied that the Son is of the
 Same Substance with the Father.

But the *Arian* D. *Crine*, which teach-
 es, that the Son was indeed before the
 World, but not from Eternity; and that
 there was a Time in which the Son was not,
 is no where found in the First Ages of the
 Church; but was condemned as a New
 Monster in Religion in the Fourth. So
Atanas. cont. *Ari.* Or. 2. 2. sic illospe —
 who hath heard such things as these?
 And to whom it is left, *etiam in scriptis*
 Ser. This is not from the Fathers, but
 is of Yesterday. And *Hilar. Pict. E-*
pisc. ad Constant. August. 1. it is novella luctus,
 a New Pest; a Pest that hath no more
 of Antiquity, than of Truth to sweeten it.

And indeed it was not any of the an-
 cient Fathers (as this Letter falsely pre-
 tends), but *Arius*, a Presbyter of *Alex-*
andria, in the 4th Age of the Church,
 that invented that *Heresy*, from whom
 it took the Name of *Arianism*. As he
 was the first, who in this way sought to
 undermine, and subvert the Divinity of
 the Son, so he had somewhat a like Exit
 with *Judas*, who betrayed him. For as
 this Traytor burst asunder, and his Bow-
 els gushed out; so this Heretic, present-

ly upon his Perjury, whereby he would seem to abjure, but still retain the Poyson of his *Heretic*, voided his bowels in a common *Take*.

This was thought a Warning-Piece to the *Arians* then, and ought to be considered by the *Suinnians* now. Since they have improved this *Heretic*, as the *Pharisees* did their *Prophets*, by making it sevenfold more the Child of Hell than it was; it being in some degrees more gross, daring, and anti-scriptural; and carried on by no less Falshood, Treachery, and Wickedness than the other; excepting the Formality of an Oath, and that Blood, and Tortures, which these Men have not the power of.

The Letter proceeds, p. 20. But did Superstition stop here? No. For there shortly arose another Doctrine, that the Son and Holy Ghost, are the *same* God with the Father, not only (as the *Nicene Fathers* explained the Matter) by Unity of Will, and specifick Identity, or sameness of Substance, but by numerical, or true Identity, and sameness of Substance and Nature.

Ans. 1. This Council did intend a numerical Unity, or sameness of Substance, that there might be no room left for any Cavills about three Gods.

2. The Church was so far from any new Doctrine, that that Age, as well as the next did celebrate this Creed as the standing Rule of Faith to all the Churches. *Epiphani. adv. Her. l. 2. to c. 72.* calls it *ἐκκλησιαστικὴν πίστιν* the Ecclesiastical Rule of Faith. *Greg. Nys. to 2. c. 1. Epistom. l. 1.* In our Creed there is *ὁμοούσιον* *λέγει* the word consubstantial, which must be the Creed of Nice, and yet this is ours. *Basil to 3. Epistle 6.* recites this, and calls it the Creed *ἡμεῖς ὡς* in use with you. *Ambros. de fid. l. 1. c. 8, 9.* quotes part of this Creed about the Consubstantiality, and then saith, this is the Doctrine of the Church, which anathematizes them that teach otherwise. And *Evag. H. l. 3. c. 17.* this was used in Baptism then, as the Creed called the Apostles is now with us; and was confirmed by the next General Council at Constantinople.

They

They all kept up to this Rule, and intended the same thing; though they did not all agree in the manner of explaining, and proving it. What room then there could be here left for any new Doctrine soon after this Council at Nice, I am yet to learn.

SECT. 7.

Hence he proceeds to some Eminent Authors, who (the Letter saith) are either Arian or Socinian.

1. Erasmus is thought an Arian, p. 31. to colour, which pretence, he quotes him upon *Philip. 2. 6.* and *Ephes. 5. 5.*

Ans. The former Text, he thinks, doth respect not his Nature, but the manner of his appearance and behaviour: But yet he grants us that Christ is God, though he thinks this Text doth not prove it. And on *Ephes. 5. 5.* the Kingdom of God, and of Christ: he declares that these words do not deny the Divinity of the Son.

But

But had this Letter pursued Truth, and not the support of an Error, it would likewise have told the Reader, that upon John 1. 1. *The Word was God*; he asserts that there is *Divinam Essentiam tribus personis Communem*; a Divine Essence common to three Persons; Which is all we contend for; and which alone speaks *Erasmus* himself as true a *Trinitarian*, as the Author of the *Athanasian Creed*.

His Paraphrase upon this clause [in the beginning was the Word] saith, the Eternal Word was with the Eternal Father; yet by the Word he understands not the Command, Power or Wisdom of God; but a Person; as appears from the last quotation before this; and consequently he here asserts both the Personality, and Eternity of the Word, which is the very Doctrine we teach.

John 8. 5, 8. before Abraham was, I am, he renders, *Priusquam nasceretur*, before Abraham was born; to the end he might distinguish (as he saith himself) the manner of Abraham's Existence from Christ's, Abraham was in time,

time, but [*semper est Christus*] Christ is always; which directly contradicts both the *Sacrian*, who denies Christs Existence before his Incarnation; and also the *Arian*, who denies his Existence from Eternity. Upon these words he quotes St. *Austin*, who glosses thus, *Abraham was made*, but Christ is that denotes a Creature, this a being Eternally existing.

It is plain then that *Erasmus* taught a Trinity. And certainly he would not think that the ignorant, and dull side of the question (as the Letter speaks) which he teaches for Orthodox Divinity. All the difference between him and ourselves is this, that we agree in the same Doctrine, but differ only in some of those Medicines that should petive it. For which reason brought to be read with caution and judgment.

The Letter saith that this Author in his *Scholia* on the third tome of St. *Jerom's* Epistles, denies that the *Arians* are Hereticks. Had he told us upon what Epistle these *Scholia* are, we might have examined, the place without much

much loss of time: But I presume, he thinks himself safe under so loose a Reference, hoping none will turn over a Volume to disprove him.

In his Epistle to Bilibaldus thus, I (saith Erasmus) could be of the Arian persuasion, if the Church approved it.

Ans. The Author thus, *cum Arianis, & Pelagianis sentire possim, si probasset ecclesia quod illi docuerunt: Nec mihi non sufficiunt verba Christi, sed mirum videri non debet, si sequor interpretem Ecclesiam, cujus Auctoritate persuasus credo Scripturarum Canonicarum.* I could be of the same mind with the Arians, and Pelagians, if the Church had approved what they taught: Not that the words of Christ do not satisfy me, but it ought not to seem strange, if I follow the Judgment of the Church, by whose Authority I believe the Canonical Scripture, which place is certainly against him: For

1. He saith the words of Christ do satisfy him, i. e. as to *Arianism*, and *Pelagianism*, before mentioned.

2. He puts *Arianism*, and *Pelagianism* together, implying that he had no more favour for that, than for this;

which

time, but [*scilicet* of *Christus*] Christ is always; which directly contradicts both the Socinians, who denies Christs Existence before his Incarnation; and also the Arians, who denies his Existence from Eternity. Upon these words he quotes St. Austin, who glosses thus, *Abraham was made*, but Christ is that denotes a Creature, this a being Eternally existing.

It is plain then that *Erasmus* taught a Trinity. And certainly he would not think that the ignorant, and dull side of the question (as the Letter speaks) which he teaches for Orthodox Divinity. All the difference between him and ourselves is this, that we agree in the same Doctrine, but differ only in some of those Mediums that should prove it. For which reason he ought to be read with caution and judgment.

The Letter saith that this Author in his *Scholia* on the third tome of St. Jeron's Epistles, denies that the *Arians* are *Hereticks*. Had he told us upon what Epistle these *Scholia* are, we might have examined the place without much

much loss of time: But I presume, he thinks himself safe under so loose a Reference, hoping none will turn over a Volume to disprove him.

In his Epistle to Bilibaldus thus, I (saith Erasmus) could be of the Arian persuasion, if the Church approved it.

Ans. The Author thus, cum Arianis, & Pelagianis sentire possim, si probasset ecclesia quod illi docuerunt: Nec mihi non sufficiunt verba Christi, sed mirum videri non debet, si sequor interpretem Ecclesiam, cujus Authoritate persuasus credo Scripturarum Canonice. I could be of the same mind with the Arians, and Pelagians, if the Church had approved what they taught: Not that the words of Christ do not satisfy me, but it ought not to seem strange, if I follow the Judgment of the Church, by whose Authority I believe the Canonical Scripture, which place is certainly against him: For

1. He saith the words of Christ do satisfy him, i. e. as to Arianism, and Pelagianism, before mentioned.

2. He puts Arianism, and Pelagianism together, implying that he had no more favour for that, than for this; which

which I do not remember he was ever charged with. Therefore

3. His design is not to favour this, or other Heresy, but only to shew how far he could give up his Faith to the Judgment of the Church: And consequently his own sense must be much distant from both these Perswasions, else this could be no Argument of his wonderful Submission to the Churches Authority.

A Romanist may make good advantage of this, and therefore the Paris Doctors never put it among their Censures. But it no more helps the Socinian, than the things he calls his Arguments, and Demonstrations.

He proceeds p. 31. *Grotius is Socinian all over*, and p. 32. *there is nothing in all his Annotations which they, viz. the Socinians do not approve, and applaud.*

Ans. Upon Job. 1. 1. these words [in the beginning] *Grotius* will have to be taken from Gen. 1. 1. and understands them of the Creation properly, or of the beginning of the Creature: As he doth also v. 2. [by him were all things made.] For which he quotes the

Epistle

Epistle of *Barnabas*, *Justin*, *Athenagoras*,
Tatian, *Tertullian*, and others

This word [was] he renders *jam tum erat*, then was, or did exist, when all Creatures began: By which Existence before time he understands an Eternal Existence: And yet he holds the [Word] or Son not for the Command or simple Power of God, but for a Person. Where observe that *Grotius* teaches that the Son is a Person eternally existing, who (in a proper sense) made, or created the World, and if either *Arian* or *Socinian* approve, or applaud this they must each depart from his own Heresy.

Therefore when upon those words, *Colos.* 1. 16. *by him; viz. the Son; as Grotius* himself takes it, were all things, *facta* [created]; he saith, this word is sometimes applied to the New Creature; we must understand him, as shewing the Various Acceptations of the word, not as designing hereby to deny the Son to be Creator, because he so expressly ascribes Creation to him upon that Text of *St. John*.

3. In p. 22. he pretends, that Pelagius grants, that the Fathers before the Nicene Council, did agree in their Doctrine concerning God, with the Socinian, and concerning the Son, and Holy Spirit, with the Arians.

Ans. 1. Pelagius saith no such thing. Let the Socinian vindicate himself, by referring us to the places.

2. Had he said so, the Quotations we have given the Reader out of Ignatius, Iustin, Irenaeus, Clemens, Tertullian, and others, would abundantly confute him.

3. Patanus himself was a Trinitarian, as appears from what he hath wrote upon this Argument: And

4. He did not accuse these Fathers of Arianism, or Socinianism, but only censured some of those Arguments, by which they would establish the Doctrine of a Trinity.

5. The Letter reports Episcopius suspected of Arianism p. 34. 35. he saith, the Father is so first, as to be first in Order (i. e. in time.)

Ans. 1. *Episcopus* saith, the Father is first in Order, which we all grant : But it is the *Socinian* Comment, that makes the first in Order to be the first in time, which we deny. Because though the Father is first in Order, yet the Son is Co-eternal with the Father, as before.

2. This Author denies a Co-ordination, and asserts a Subordination of Persons in the Trinity : But this Subordination doth not destroy, but only Explains the Doctrine of a Trinity, as is noted already. And,

3. In his *Institut. Theol.* l. 4. c. 32. He ascribes a Divine Nature to Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, and teaches that they are all properly Persons : And if this be *Arianism*, or *Socinianism*, we are all such.

5. He Complements his dear Friend *Sandius* for a Gentleman of Prodigious Industry, and Reading : and no less ingenious than Learned.

M

Ans.

Ans. Whatever his Industry, and Learning was, I must deny both his Judgment and Honesty.

1. His Judgment. For he knows not how to distinguish between the genuine, doubtful, and spurious Writings of the Antients; but thinks *Clemens* the Father of the Constitutions under his Name: Which is utterly impossible, because l. 7. c. 48. the Author mentions three Bishops of *Jerusalem* made by the Apostles; *James*, *Simeon*, and *Judas*: But *St. John*, the last of the twelve Died, and this *Clemens* himself suffered Martyrdom in the year 100. while *Simeon* lived about seven years after: How then the Apostles could appoint *Judas* his Successor, or *Clemens*, their Scribe Record it, neither their Learned *Sandius*, nor our *Socinians*, those Men of Wit, and Reason, can resolve me. They, as well as the Apostolic Canons, were probably written about the end of the Second Century, and seem to owe themselves

(ex-

(excepting their Corruptions) to
Clemens of Alexandria.

He receives likewise the Epistles ascribed to *Ignatius*; and *de Vet. Script. Eccles.* he would prove the Legitimacy of that *ad Philip.* by this Argument, *viz. Origen*, who flourished about the middle of the Third Age, hath something upon *St. Luke*, like something in that Epistle; where observe.

1. *Origen* doth not mention either *Ignatius*, or this Epistle.

2. *Ignatius*, and *Origen* might hit upon somewhat like Notions without Communication. And,

3. These ascribed Epistles are not mentioned by *Eusebius*, *Jerom*, or any other before them; whence we ought in all reason to reject them. *Dr. Peirson*, late Bishop of *Chester* observes, they appeared not till 400 years after *Ignatius*, whence he declares them spurious *Vind. Epist. 8. Ignat. c. 10.*

2. By such intolerable Errors he creates difficulties to himself. For the design of his History is to prove that all Antiquity is *Arian*: But the *Epif. ad Heron.* which is one of the ascribed, saith, that if any asserts that Christ is *ἀνθρώπου φύλον*, a mere Man (which phrase was always used in opposition to his Divinity. *Iren.* l. 3. c. 26. and *Eusebius* in the case of *Ebion*) the same is a Jew and a Murderer of Christ. Now had he like a Man of Art, and Judgment, rejected these Epistles, he had removed this Block, at which he must now stumble and fall.

2. I deny his Honesty. For *Hist.* l. 1. *Secul.* 1. he will have the Creed called the Apostles, to be composed by them, to be the only Creed used in the Church; and that very Creed too, which was established at *Nice*: And that *Evag. H.* l. 3. c. 17. saying, we are Baptized into a Creed composed by 318 Bishops, intended no other but this: When this was never mentioned in that Council,
and

and the Concert is totally Ruined by the Testimonies we have already produced upon this Argument, *Sect. 4.*

Should I draw out all the instances of weakness and knavery, I should leave but little of that book behind me. A fit man for an Ecclesiastical Historian, whose want of Judgment, and Honesty makes his writings like a sword in some mens hands, dangerous to them, that come in the reach of it. Sure I am, no Student ought to read him till he is well acquainted with the true state, and doctrine of antiquity. His accounts of antiquity, and the brief history of the Socinians, may go together; and if each will be pretenders to wit, and reason, I matter not, so long as we have on our side better pretensions to truth, and Honesty.

Dr. *Wallis* in one of his letters gives an account of this *Sandius's* conversion, and his dying in the Trinitarian Faith. I earnestly pray that the same Mercy,

(166)

and Goodness, would open the eyes of
all *Arians* and *Socinians*, that they may
no longer lye under strong delusions,
and the belief of a Lye but may come
to the knowledg of the truth, and be
saved.

28 JY 58

F I N I S.

*Books Printed for John Everingham
at the Star in Ludgate-Street.*

AN Enquiry into Several Remarkable texts of the old and new Testament, which contain some difficulty in them: with a probable Resolution of them, In two parts. *By John Edwards, B. D. sometime Fellow of St. John's Colledge in Cambridge.*

A new Discourse of Trade, wherein is Recommended several weighty Points relating to Companies of Merchants. The Act of Navigation, Naturalization of Strangers; and our Woollen Manufactures, the Ballance of Trade, and the nature of Plantations, and their Consequences in Relation to the Kingdom, are seriously Discussed. And some Proposals for erecting a Court of Merchants for determining Controversies, relating to
Ma-

Maritime Affairs, and for a Law for
Transferrance of Bills of Debts, are
humbly Offered. By Sir *Josiah Child*.

Miscellaneous Essays: By Monsieur
St. Euremont, Translated out of *French*,
with a Character, by a Person of Ho-
nour here in *England*, continued by
Mr. Dryden.

Monarchia Microcosmi: The Origin,
Vicissitudes, and Period of Vital Go-
vernment in Man. For a farther Dis-
covery of Diseases, incident to Hu-
man Nature. By *Everard Maynwaringe*,
M. D.

28 JY 58
